

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

APR 26 1961

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

APRIL 1961

Contributors Include

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION AND

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

G. S. DUNCAN, O.B.E., D.D., LL.D.

ADAM FOX, M.A., D.D.

KENNETH GRAYSTON, M.A.

C. S. LEWIS

HAROLD K. MOULTON, M.A.

SUSIE I. TUCKER, M.A.

THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

ERIC BAKER, M.A., D.D., PH.D.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE, M.A., B.D.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A., D.D.

W. J. NOBLE, D.D.

JOHN T. WILKINSON, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.



THE EPWORTH PRESS

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings and Sixpence Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments		How the New English Bible was Made	
Dr Leslie F. Church		by G. S. Duncan, O.B.E. D.D., LL.D.	109
by W. J. Noble, D.D.	77	Religious Values of the New Version	
The Authorized Version and the New English Bible		by Kenneth Grayston, M.A.	113
by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	79	The English of the New Translation	
The Principles of Biblical Translation		by The Bishop of Winchester	118
by Harold K. Moulton, M.A.	83	Charles Gore	
The Historical and Literary Setting of the Authorized Version		by W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.	123
by Susie I. Tucker, M.A.	89	The Theology of Worship	
The Influence of the Authorized Version on the Religious Life of Britain		by A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D.	127
by Adam Fox, M.A., D.D.	95	William Law	
The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version		by Eric Baker, M.A., D.D., PH.D.	139
by C. S. Lewis	100	Recent Literature	
		edited by John T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.	144
		Notable Articles in Periodicals	155
		Our Contributors	156

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

To provide a Home for neglected and homeless girls and boys was the great ideal in the heart and mind of Dr. Stephenson when he founded the Children's Home in 1869. It remains the chief objective of its policy, for though social conditions have improved, there are still children who are deprived of a real home-life, with all that means in sorrow and tragedy.

So long as the need continues the National Children's Home will do its utmost to help these little people.

PLEASE HELP US TO CARRY ON



Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

DR LESLIE F. CHURCH

THE DEATH of Dr Leslie F. Church on 17th January, evoked a large number of tributes in the religious and secular press, from colleagues and friends, and from organizations with which he had been connected. But the list, however long, would be incomplete without a reference in this magazine, of which he was editor for eighteen years, from 1935 to 1953. He regarded it as one of his major concerns, and served it with unwearied diligence and success. Not a little of its eminence is due to Dr Church's long tenure of the editorship. He was responsible also for other Methodist magazines, and only those who have direct knowledge of such work can realize how exacting and demanding it can be, with the selection and assembling of material, the writing of the editor's own contribution, and the inexorable date-line for publication rushing, as it seems, into view.

Dr Church came into the ministry from the manse, and some few elderly people still remember his father with affection and esteem. There is no doubt that the example of the home strongly influenced the thinking of the son about his future, and it was at an early age that he became conscious of that call to the Ministry of which at no time in his life did he have the least doubt. He was separated unto the gospel of God. On being accepted as a candidate he was sent to Headingley College, and in 1908 began his ministry in Caterham, where, in addition to other duties, he came in contact with men in the forces—an opportunity he greatly prized, and in which he had conspicuous success, so much so that he served for a time as a chaplain in the First World War.

Leslie Church, in spite of his gifts, or because of his gifts refined by grace, was one of the humblest of men. He never looked for or expected the chief places in the synagogue, and from Caterham he went on to twenty years of faithful and outstanding service as a circuit minister, glad to labour in that sphere with all the hundreds of his colleagues in the same ministry. He rightly held that the circuit life of the Church was of supreme value and importance. Thus, mostly in and around London, he brought to bear upon that ministry the powers of a consecrated and cultured personality. He was a preacher of the first rank, who combined scholarship and exposition with deep evangelical conviction and appeal, and men and women flocked to hear him. He was in constant demand as a preacher and lecturer, though he never sought popularity, or neglected his primary duty to his own people. He was guide and friend to a host of young people, while holding the affection and respect of their elders. His sermons and addresses scintillated with apt and pertinent illustrations, but he never 'talked down' to a congregation. He drew them up to his level.

That faithful ministry was exchanged for one of a very different type when in 1929 he was chosen as tutor in Pastoral Theology at Richmond College. The next six years gave him the chance, of which he took the greatest advantage, of helping numbers of young students who were preparing for the Ministry. Those who profited so greatly from his teaching are one in their gratitude for his unassuming and unforced friendship, and for his lectures on Church History and especially on Pastoral Theology—a subject so near his heart that he could not fail to put it in its rightful place in the mind of his students. He was entirely happy at Richmond, but after only six years he was chosen in 1935 for the important post of Connexional Editor. He did such notable service in these different spheres that one was inclined to say of him that there was nothing in the wide range of the Ministry of the Methodist Church for which he was not outstandingly competent, though it may be true that he would not have turned to an administrative post as his first choice.

The eighteen years at the Epworth Press were marked by a very large output of work, in the magazines and in books and articles, and in the arduous task of reading and judging manuscripts and advising writers. His books of devotion, in a number of which he had the able co-operation of his wife, enjoyed, and enjoy, a wide circulation. His last principal work, a one-volume edition of Matthew Henry's massive commentary, has had an immense demand, so that the first edition has been sold out before publication, even at 75s. a copy.

In 1943 Dr Church was President of the Conference, and he used that wider opportunity with indefatigable zeal, even in the midst of the war, visiting, amongst others, service units in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. When he retired in 1953, he had completed forty-five years of devoted and distinguished service, and he continued writing and preaching and speaking up to the end. For a number of years he was a member of the Editorial Committee of the *Methodist Recorder*, where his contribution was marked by wisdom and insight, and increased the esteem in which he was held by his fellow-directors of the paper.

To know Church as colleague and friend was an inestimable privilege. His high attainments in more than one sphere did not cut him off from ordinary people. He loved people, in fact, and they loved him. He had no affectations, made no parade of learning or of any other gifts, gave to his friends a loyalty which could not be over-valued, maintained through his life a simplicity and sincerity which were understanding and forgiving, followed his Lord with undivided allegiance, and entered into the secret places of that communion with Christ whence Christians draw their strength. These are characteristics, not a catalogue. They are facets which combined to make the sparkling and priceless jewel of his life.

W. J. NOBLE

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION AND THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

IN THIS ISSUE we celebrate two great occasions—the 350th anniversary of the Authorized Version and the publication of the New Testament of the New English Bible.

Of the Authorized Version Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch said that it was 'out and away the greatest book of English Prose', and it would be easy to quote many and more rapturous appreciations than that. But it is too late in the day for that to be either necessary or desirable. We all know its supreme value, and where there is none to dispute, it is superfluous to plead. Its style is fundamentally simple and yet it can rise to the richest and fullest eloquence; its phrases are lovingly and carefully fashioned and yet there is no striving for effect, no self-conscious adornment; it is admirably fitted for reading aloud, whether in the intimacy of the fireside circle or in the public worship of a great congregation; it is imbued with a solemn spirit of reverence for the matters of which it speaks; and its cadences have the movement and warmth and weight and dignity which befit the things of Him who is the God both of majesty and loving kindness. However many other translations of the Bible may be made, this one will never cease to move and inspire those in every part of the earth who speak the English tongue.

Mr Arthur Clutton-Brock once said: 'It is more than a translation; it expresses the religious thoughts and emotions of Englishmen as well as of Jews and early Christians.' If that is so, it is because it has had a great part in forming those thoughts and emotions. For three and a half centuries it has been more often read in private, more often heard in public, more often referred to and quoted, than any other book in our language; and that steady, regular, continuing use has brought us all under its power.

One of the most extraordinary things about the Authorized Version is that it was made by a committee. It is true that they used the work of previous translators, some of them translators of genius. Nevertheless, as 'Q' says, 'that a large committee of forty-seven should have gone steadily through the great mass of Holy Writ, seldom interfering with genius, yet, when interfering, seldom missing to improve: that a committee of forty-seven should have captured (or even, let us say, should have retained and improved) a rhythm so personal, so constant, that our Bible has the voice of one author speaking through its many mouths: that . . . is a wonder before which I can only stand humble and aghast'.

Of the previous writers whose work this committee used, Tyndale is incomparably the most important. Take, for example, the parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15. Here is what Tyndale makes of it—

What man of you havynge an hundred shepe, if he loose one of them doth not leave nynty and nyne in the wildernes, and goo after hym which is loost, vntil he fynde hym? And when he hath founde hym, he putteth hym on his shulders with ioye: And as sone as he commeth home he calleth to gedder his lovers, and neghbours

sayinge vnto them: reioyse with me, for I have founde my shepe which was loost. I say vnto you, that lyke wyse ioye shalbe in heven over one synner that repenteth, moore then over nynyety and nyne iuste persons, whiche nede noo repentaunce.

There was not much that the committee of forty-seven needed to do to that.

They used, however, the work of other early translators as well. From Wycliffe, for example, they took the 'mote' and the 'beam', and the words 'strait is the gate and narewe is the way'. From Coverdale they adopted 'loving kindness', 'tender mercy' and 'wrapped in swaddling clothes'. The Genevan Version supplied them with 'a house divided against itself', and the Rheims Version gave them 'With the mouth confession is made to salvation'.

After 350 years their version has tremendous authority. That is partly due to its familiarity. We have all known it from our earliest days; its words and rhythms entered our minds in childhood; they have been read by us at home and read to us in church; they have been quoted in speeches and conversations and books, and have been set to music heard not only in church but in concert halls and on the radio. The result is that the thoughts of the original writers and the words in which the Authorized Version expresses them have been so joined together that we cannot separate them. Through the years they have also gathered precious associations. We have used them in our prayers, we have been stirred by them at baptisms and weddings, we have been comforted by them at the funerals of our loved ones. We have been cheered by them in despondency, given strength by them in weakness, been challenged by them in sin, been commanded by them in crisis. In all circumstances they have spoken to us, and they carry with them the power which such associations inevitably bring. They have, too, the authority of that which is venerable. The language is in some ways different from that we use now, but it is commanding because it is that which has been spoken by, and which has spoken to, generations of our forefathers. There is authority behind the fact that it has been in constant use for three and a half centuries.

Nevertheless, we all know that the Authorized Version suffers from its age as well as benefits from it. Familiarity with it makes us dull to its meaning, its antique expressions prevent us from feeling it as the word of God for today, some of it is undeniably obscure, and some of it has been shown by modern scholarship to be mistaken. Modern versions have therefore been gladly received, both by those inside the Churches and those outside them, and for all such versions we are immensely grateful. So far, however, each of these modern translations has been the work of an individual, and has carried no more weight than has been warranted by the skill and scholarship of a single man. But now once more we have a translation by a committee. Because of that fact it has more claim upon our consideration; it will be more dependable for accuracy. It does not follow, however, that it will be better in any other respect; indeed, those who know the way of committees may well feel that in style it is likely to be worse than a translation made by one man. 'Q' thought the fact that the Authorized Version had been produced by a committee was a miracle. Has a comparable miracle now been wrought through another committee? It is not at a first reading that a judgement about that question can be made; translations of the Bible can prove themselves only in use. Little more can be done with the new translation at present than to describe it.

The obvious thing about the New English Bible is, of course, that it is written in the language of the twentieth century and not that of the early seventeenth. This is partly a matter of the actual words used. The mere avoidance of antique words such as 'espoused', antique meanings of words such as 'edify', antique forms such as the 'th' ending of verbs in the third person singular, and antique ways of speech such as that of using pronouns in the second person singular (except in prayers addressed directly to God), in itself carries one a certain way towards modernity. So does the use of words which have come into service since 1611. In the New English Bible the ancient heroes of the Old Testament are described as 'refugees in deserts and on the hills' (Heb 11₃₈; cf. Phillips); John the Baptist says to soldiers who ask him how they are to live, 'no blackmail' (Lk 3₁₄; cf. Rieu); and the Apostle James, writing to the Church, says 'you must never show snobbery' (Jas 2₁; cf. Phillips). Here are words which the Authorized Version could not use. 'Refugee' has not been found in print earlier than 1685 (and, of course, has recently acquired new associations); 'blackmail' (in this sense) was not used until 1840; and 'snobbery' was first used in 1833. Yet there are not a great many such words in the new translation, and we have not noticed any at all which are creations of the twentieth century. Its feeling of modernity is probably more due to the modern structure of its sentences (Col 1₉₋₁₇, which is all one sentence in A.V., is divided into eight in N.E.B.), its contemporary rhythms, and its use of common idioms and even colloquialisms.

A feeling for good idiomatic English is everywhere present. Paul, instead of being 'an Hebrew of the Hebrews' is a 'Hebrew born and bred' (Phil 3₅); the warning 'if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another' becomes 'if you go on fighting one another, tooth and nail, all you can expect is mutual destruction' (Gal 5₁₅); and there are many little touches—such as 'sinners' being called 'bad characters' (Mk 2₁₈), Peter feeling 'hurt' instead of 'grieved' (Jn 21₁₇), and Paul concluding a letter with 'My love to you all' instead of 'My love be with you all' (1 Cor 16₂₄)—where a quite simple change to modern usage makes all the difference.

The colloquialisms are most noticeable in the Gospels. Thus the tenants in the Parable of the Vineyard say 'This is the heir; come on, let us kill him' (Mt 21₃₈; cf. Moffatt); Martha, complaining of her sister, says 'Tell her to come and lend a hand' (Lk 10₄₁, cf. Moffatt and Rieu); the Prodigal Son 'began to feel the pinch' (Lk 15₁₄; so also Phillips); and the soldiers at the foot of the cross, discussing Christ's tunic, say 'let us toss for it' (Jn 19₃₄). But Paul also uses familiar speech on occasion, and talks about being 'cheered up' (2 Cor 2₂), 'bragging' (2 Cor 11₁₇), and 'sponging' upon his converts (2 Cor 12₁₃).

Under the heading of modernity we ought probably to include the toning down of the rhetorical quality of the Authorized Version. The contrasts of 2 Corinthians 6₉₋₁₀, for example, are less emphatic and less succinctly made than those we are used to; the sixfold repetition of 'whatsoever' in Philippians 4₈ is diminished to a fourfold repetition of 'all', with a consequent loss of intensity; and Romans 8₃₈₋₃₉, which in the Authorized Version builds up to such a climax as to become almost a shout, is moderated to: 'For I am convinced that there is nothing in death or life, in the realm of spirits or superhuman powers, in the world as it is or the world as it shall be, in the forces of the universe, in

heights or depths—nothing in all creation that can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.' That is still good, indeed it is very good, but it lacks the sheer drive and weight of the translation of 1611. Perhaps the New English Bible is right to have toned it down. After all, rhetoric is nowadays out of favour and feels somewhat unnatural; if Paul had been a child of our age he would not have produced it. But in a passage like this, one cannot help missing it all the same.

This is not necessarily to say that the style of the new translation is inferior to that of the old. There are many felicities of expression—'the noise of battle near at hand and the news of battles far away' (Mt 24₈), 'he who is nearest to the Father's heart' (Jn 1₁₈), 'sparkling like crystal' (Rev 22₁)—and there are new, firm, clear rhythms, as in such passages as: 'Be rooted in him; be built in him; be consolidated in the faith you were taught; let your hearts overflow with thankfulness' (Col 2₆₋₇). The style is different, as of course it ought to be different; whether, of its own kind, it is as good it is almost impossible at this stage to say. The old still runs in our minds and the new has yet to become familiar; only after we have thoroughly got used to the new shall we be able to say whether it is as excellent as the old.

As one would expect, there are changes in interpretation, sometimes because of the adoption of a different reading, sometimes because of a better understanding of an old one. The second half of James 1₁₇ is changed from 'with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning' to 'With him there is no variation, no play of passing shadows', with a note to say that '*Some witnesses read* no variation, or shadow caused by change'. In 1 Peter 5₈, 'Be sober' becomes 'Awake!' The comment in John 4₉, 'for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans', becomes 'Jews and Samaritans, it should be noted, do not use vessels in common', with a note to say '*Or* Jews, it should be noted, are not on familiar terms with Samaritans: *some witnesses omit these words*'. In 2 Corinthians 2₁₇, the words 'For we are not as many, which corrupt the word of God' become 'At least we do not go hawking the word of God about'. In Acts 4₁₃, 'unlearned and ignorant men' becomes 'untrained laymen'. And in Philipians 4₁₈, instead of reading 'But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you', we find: 'However, here I give you my receipt for everything—for more than everything; I am paid in full, now that I have received from Epaphroditus what you sent.'

Some words and phrases are translated in such a way that they are at the same time interpreted. The phrase 'an unknown tongue' becomes 'the language of ecstasy' (1 Cor 14₈, etc), 'a natural body' becomes 'an animal body' (1 Cor 15₄₄; so also Weymouth), 'in Christ' becomes 'united with Christ' (Rom 12₅, etc), 'the flesh' becomes 'the lower nature' (Gal 6₈, etc.; cf. Phillips and Weymouth), 'the saints' becomes 'God's people' (Eph 2₁₉, etc.; cf. Weymouth), 'the old man' becomes 'the old nature' (Col 3₉; so also Moffatt), 'seasoned with salt' becomes 'never insipid' (Col 4₆), 'therein is the righteousness of God revealed' becomes 'here is revealed God's way of righting wrong' (Rom 1₁₇), and 'him that justifieth the ungodly' becomes 'him who acquits the guilty' (Rom 4₅).

The result of all this, together with such a device as the use of quotation marks, the translation of such technical terms as 'Corban', the dividing up of sentences

which has already been mentioned, and the careful construction of the clauses so that the emphasis falls quite naturally in the right place, is great clarity. Tyndale wrote his version for 'the boy that driveth the plow'. The corresponding person in our day is 'the man in the street', and he will find the new translation at least as clear as (and of course much more accurate than) the ploughboy of Tyndale's age. Tyndale himself, we think, would be pleased with the result. Did he not say, 'if they perceive in any places that I have not attained the very sense of the tongue, or meaning of the Scripture, or have not given the right English word, that they put to their hand to amend it, remembering that so is their duty to do'? This is not an amending of Tyndale; it is a new translation. But it has been made on the principles which Tyndale followed—it has gone back, as far as it has been possible to find it, to the Greek original; it has tried to convey the sense which was in the mind of the writer; and it has put that sense into contemporary English idiom. Whether it will be found acceptable in general use remains to be seen, but our feeling is that it will. It is a Bible in our own tongue, dignified, suitable to be read aloud, and as accurate and clear as the translators can make it. We believe that it will win its way.

J. ALAN KAY

THE PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL TRANSLATION

Harold K. Moulton

MOST MEN know only one language, and even the most learned know only a few. Yet most languages have literature which ought to be generally shared. Hence the need for translations, so that others may enjoy the original in a language that they can understand.

Yet every translator is faced from the start with a problem that can never be fully solved. No two languages exactly correspond. Apart from grammatical differences which can be overcome quite easily, or complications of vocabulary which yield to a little thought, there are idioms which have to be entirely rethought, and overtones which simply cannot be reproduced. If you want to write English suitable for easy translation, you use sparingly our habit of putting a preposition after a verb. Why should a foreigner be puzzled with the fact that invent, discern, transfer, travel towards, understand, attack, and decamp are idiomatically expressed in English by make up, make out, make over, make for, make of, make at, and make off? And if you want to transmit the feel of 'The curfew tolls the knell of parting day' into a language which knows nothing either of ancient curfew custom or of funeral bells, you lay down your pen in despair. 'The end of a day is like its funeral, and the tomtom which tells us to put out our fires is like the drum that is beaten at funerals'? That

hardly seems to leave us with either intelligibility or magic. In another sphere, imagine trying to translate the overtones of a set of crossword clues.

The translator has to abandon hope of achieving exact correspondence. He has to modify his ambition in accordance with the maxim: give the reader the spirit of the original composition in wording as close as the idiom of the second language will allow. Yet even here there is room for considerable latitude. What is to be the balance between spirit and letter? Which way does faithfulness lie? That worthy series of nineteenth-century classical cribs edited by the respected Bohn came down on the side of the baldest literalism. It was far from beautiful, but you did feel that you were on solid ground. Gilbert Murray's translations of choruses from Euripides, or Fitzgerald's version of Omar Khayyám, are true poems in their own right and might be described as based on the originals, but 'based' is perhaps too solid a word for things of beauty that are in danger of floating right away from their point of origin.

The answer to this dilemma depends to some extent on the purpose of the translation. Mr Bohn was thinking of schoolboys in danger of dire punishment if they strayed from the narrow path. His translation had that end in view. Gilbert Murray wanted to build a bridge for beauty, and did not feel that the stones of the original language could be exactly copied for its construction.

Provided a man is intellectually honest, he may be granted much liberty. Probably when he is dealing with scientific or historical fact he had better err on the side of literal accuracy. That will be the chief demand of his readers. On the other hand, when literary and artistic considerations are involved, often the more free he is the better. He is more likely to be approved than condemned if his translation is a work of art, as the original is—and works of art are not produced by the principle of verbal equation. His translation will stand or fall on literary and aesthetic grounds. It will not matter vitally if his interpretation is open to question at some point. That will provide material for discussion, but probably nothing more serious.

Biblical translation has many elements in common with the practice of translation as a whole. Its aim is to reproduce an original in a language that other readers can understand. It makes the same demand for intellectual and spiritual honesty. It allows a certain amount of room for liberty. But other factors are involved which operate very little or not at all in non-Scriptural translations.

In the first place, the vast majority of translators and readers of the Bible believe that they are dealing, not with an ordinary human book, but with the Word of God. They may hold varied views as to its inspiration. Some claim that every word is literally inspired; others would speak of the divine nature of its general spirit. But almost without exception they would believe that they were handling a book that needed particularly careful treatment because it came from a level above that of ordinary human intelligence.

That being so, there is a great deal to be said for turning towards a literal rather than a free translation. The two great English versions, the King James Version of 1611 and the Revised Version of 1885, have the merit of being as close to the Hebrew and Greek originals as the knowledge of their times allowed them to be. This may sometimes make them a little obscure, but the reader

can be certain of their faithfulness. There is very little indulgence in paraphrase. For the exact student, such translations have their very great value. When he is using them, he can feel that he is based on the rock. When he is using the Revised Standard Version, he must sometimes wonder whether difficulties have not been glossed over in order to produce something intelligible in translation. When he reads the New English Bible, he will be struck with its insight, but if he tried to use it as a base for translating into yet another language, the result would be further from the original than if he used the older English versions. As soon as you cease to be literal and depart in any degree from the original, to that extent you are in danger of departing from objectivity. The British and Foreign Bible Society has had this in mind in the 'Translators' Translation' which it is now preparing. This aims at being both as clear and as literal as it can be, consistent with readability, so that further translators may have the original meaning diverted as little as possible by the idioms of an intermediate language. Not that most readers read with the aim of further translation, but such a piece of work is a reminder of one of the principles of biblical translation—faithfulness.

A second distinction between Biblical translation and that of other books is that the Bible is the one book in the world that is far more familiar in translation than it is in the original. The Bible Society has had one interesting reminder of this uniqueness. In studying the law of copyright in order to safeguard the text of its translations, it has discovered that that law is very naturally devised to safeguard the rights, not of the translator, but of the original author, and it is often a little difficult to apply its provisions! But familiarity always tends to overbalance into conservatism, especially when it is religious familiarity, and makes people often very slow to receive new translations of Scripture, even when they are demonstrably more accurate. How many of us, for instance, stick to 'Comforter' in John 14₁₆, even when we know that it has little to do with 'comfort' in the modern sense of the word! Other words may be more accurate, but 'helper' sounds a little weak, 'advocate' too legal, and 'Paraclete' too pedantic so we cling to the word with associations, even though they may not be correct ones.

This is not a modern failing. The Latin Vulgate was for 1,000 years the official Bible of the Roman Church, and men went to their death for forsaking it. Yet it did not easily win its way. There is the well-known story of the bishop who read Jerome's version of the story of Jonah, in which Jonah's booth is covered with ivy, and was shouted down until he restored the familiar gourd. (I note that the Revised Standard Version has simply 'plant'. Feeble!) It may well be wondered whether some of the criticism of the 'inferior style' of the Revised Version has not been due to preference for the familiar rather than to any objective standard. The translation which can overcome the bias for the familiar has won a victory indeed.

Yet in the spheres both of literal accuracy and of freedom from the over-familiar there are dangers. Some translations have been fettered by literalism. Father Ronald Knox quotes a translation of Psalm 80—admittedly from a commentary, not from a literary version: 'Lord God of Hosts, how long wilt Thou smoke during the prayers of Thy people?' The translation is undoubtedly accurate. . . . Against that, there are certainly advantages in Moffatt and

Phillips, though all translations that tend towards paraphrase are best if they are read in comparison with the original or with a close translation. The ideal painting is one which reveals that the painter knows anatomy. A paraphrase sometimes leaves one wondering. It was the practice of earlier translators to put notes and comments in the margin, and so tendentious did they become that the Bible Society forbade the use of them in its Charter. It is all too easy, however, for a translator quite unwittingly to insert his own opinion in the text. In fact, there are many places where he must finally make his own choice as to meaning, but paraphrasing lends itself particularly to temptation. The New English Bible would appear to have largely avoided that peril. For those who know their anatomy, the shape of the bones is there. Those whose concern is with the flesh that covers them will not be in danger of finding much of it superfluous. Take, for example, John 1₁: 'the Word was God.' The New English has: 'What God was, the Word was'—not a literal, verbal translation, but one that bears the strictest scrutiny in bringing out the meaning of the sentence.

Perhaps two purposes, two rather different kinds of translation, must always be kept in mind. There is always the need for a version that is close to the original and close to the history of translation in any given language, one that is as literal as the idiom of the receiving language will allow, and that takes account as far as possible of traditional vocabulary in that language. There is also the need for companion translations that will be deliberately bold and free, challenging people to disagree if need be, but by their very disagreement to be stimulated to think. Such translations are to be condemned only if they stray from the essential meaning of the original. Provided they are faithful to that, they may have as much liberty as they can conscientiously desire. Yet they ought not be used as substitutes for the more literal versions; only as supplements. If they attract people who would not otherwise be attracted to read the Bible and find God in it, then they are fulfilling the eternal purpose of Bible-reading.

So far we have been concerned almost entirely with translation into English. How do these principles apply to translation into the other languages of the world, so much of which has been done particularly in the last century and a half? The chief difference lies, of course, in the newness of many of the languages, which often are put into writing for the first time by a Bible translator. Here he would seem to have every opportunity of making a clean start on ideal principles, unhampered by the errors of past history. And so in many ways he has. Yet even here he may be hedged in more than he has imagined. He plans a perfect phonetic alphabet, and attunes his ear to catch the smallest phonetic differences—only to find that the result is far too complicated for his potential readers. Not only is it complicated, but in many places they have already been partly exposed to some existing culture from the West, and find it easier to learn to read their own language in a spellings, not too far removed from French, say, or English. This may be deplorable. It may be condemned as perpetuating colonialism; but what it is really doing is building on the beginnings of an education.

In older languages the history of attitudes runs very closely parallel to the same history in English. Take, for example, the history of the Tamil version

in South India. The original New Testament was translated as far back as 1715. The Bible in regular use among the Lutherans until recently is dated 1777. The standard Bible used by other sections of the Tamil Church goes back to 1868. The result has been that modern revisions, though done by competent scholars and appreciated by students, have not made general headway in the Church as a whole. People have preferred to venerate the old and cling to the familiar, and have not opened their minds to new truth. In Nigeria the same attitude to the old Yoruba version has been intensified by the fact that the first New Testament translation (1862) was done by a devoted African bishop. It has been somewhat modified since, but only with great caution, even though educated people confess that they have to refer to their English Bibles to understand it.

All this underlines the vital importance of a good start. And yet so often that start is inevitably made under adverse conditions by people with little equipment beyond a zeal for evangelism, concerned primarily with somehow trying to meet a desperate need. Even today perhaps the greatest enthusiasm is shown by the Wycliffe Bible Translators, who set out often with ill-balanced resources. They have a fundamental belief that before the end of the world can come some part of the Scriptures must be translated into every language of the world. They are given very full instruction in linguistics and the vocabulary now associated with it. But often they have no comparable knowledge of the Biblical languages and are content to translate from the English Authorized Version. Nor have they any sense of the Church, and of the need that the Bible should be the Book of the Church. And their eagerness to translate into as many tongues as possible sometimes means that they perpetuate divisions when men should be linked together by a common Bible. Very serious harm can be done by bad starts of different kinds.

Yet the remedy must always be sought and can often be found. Whatever the prejudice against revision work, it is often of more importance to the Church than even a new translation. An original translation must often be made regardless of circumstances. A revision, however, must always take these carefully into account. There must be a well-informed demand for it. There must be the right people available to do it. The work must carry the Church with it. The language of the country must be at the right stage to be its proper vehicle. If some or any of these conditions are lacking, experience has shown that the work may very well prove a waste of time, or worse.

It would be congenial to illustrate fully the detailed problems of translation, so strikingly similar the world over. It would also be unfair not to remember that English is not the only European language with a long history of fine translation. Luther's version and recent German work would belie any such claim. Nor can we limit good translation work these days to Protestants. Knox's English version forbids that, and so does the less well-known 'Jerusalem' Bible in French. But we are concerned now with principle rather than with detail, and we must go on to ask in closing: how do the two versions which are the special thought of 1961 stand in the light of what has been said above with regard to translation?

While admitting that the Authorized Version is in many places outdated today both in language and in scholarship, it must never be forgotten that for

its own day it was scholarly and modern, and that throughout it was as objective as it could possibly be. It had also the advantage that perhaps more than anything else has carried it through the centuries: that of being produced at a peak period of English prose. It is consoling, too, for modern translators to remember that, like the Vulgate, it won its way slowly. It did not easily displace the Geneva Bible of fifty years earlier, nor did it for some time take the place of the Bishops' Bible for reading in churches. (It is in fact still an unsolved mystery who authorized or appointed it to be read in churches at all.) At least one of the revisers themselves, Bishop Andrewes, continued to use another version long after the revision!

Against these considerations in its favour, we can see the dangers that beset the use of all long-established versions. Like the Tamil and the Yoruba, it has often been venerated for itself rather than for its message. Its language, with the passing of years, has become less intelligible. Its scholarship has to some extent become outdated. It would argue poorly for scholarship if this were not so. It is a rock, firm and indestructible to this day, but a rock which to some extent has been left high and dry by the tide. Many of those who look for salvation will want to discover a rock that is in the midst of the waters.

The new English Bible claims to be written in 'timeless' English, and only time can substantiate that claim, or otherwise. It does certainly avoid both contemporary idiom and the obviously archaic. Its scholarship, like that of the King James Version in its day, is as abreast of the times as possible. The translation is not literal, but anyone who knows the background can see how closely it follows the original, and those who do not know may take the matter on trust. It could not be a basis for retranslation, but that is not its purpose. English is its terminus. One sample of its language may be quoted: 'Peace is my parting gift to you, my own peace, such as the world cannot give. Set your troubled hearts at rest, and banish your fears. . . . I shall not talk much longer with you, for the Prince of this world approaches. He has no rights over me; but the world must be shown that I love the Father, and do exactly as he commands; so up, let us go forward' (Jn 14^{27, 30-1}). Let that be thought through.

How long will this new translation last? How long should any translation last? I remember a Dane once telling me that in his country they reckoned that fifty years was enough, and I was surprised at the time. In the Bible Society we tend to say that a generation is enough for a new language, and I now see why. But the answer is really: As long as the translation strikes home. To make it do that is the task of the translator. He can do that task only for his own time and must leave the rest to God, but if he can do it accurately, objectively, with utter love both of the book, of its future readers, and of the two languages which he is using, then he can be the right medium of communication. 'If'! No translator matches up fully to those qualifications, but God in His mercy does use imperfect media when they dedicate their best, and through the translated word He makes known His Word.

THE HISTORICAL AND LITERARY SETTING OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION

Susie I. Tucker

WHEN KING JAMES VI of Scotland acceded to the English throne as James I, the Puritans in the Church of England were filled with hope. Queen Elizabeth had not been as whole-hearted a Protestant in matters of ritual as she had been in politics; surely King James, brought up according to the dictates of John Knox, would be more thoroughgoing. But when they left the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 they were disappointed men. Led by Dr John Rainolds, they had pressed for a simpler ceremonial, but James had given little support. The Puritans were opposing the bishops' views and, as James saw it, 'No bishop' meant 'No King'. Once more, religious progress had to wait on political prejudice.¹

Nevertheless, one thing came out of the Conference,² more positive, fundamental, and influential than any decision to forbid the sign of the Cross in baptism or the use of the ring in marriage—the Authorized Version of the Bible, which, more than any of its forerunners, was to make England, in the words of John Richard Green, 'the people of a Book'.

The royal encouragement of this undertaking marked the fact that the Protestants had established their case for an open Bible; it is well to remember that, less than 100 years before, to translate the Scriptures was to plunge into controversy, in effect to defy ecclesiastical decree,³ and to invite death as a heretic.

The forty-seven members of the Committee⁴ appointed to prepare the new version were men of high repute in Church and university life; among them were bishops and deans, masters and fellows of colleges, and regius professors. They were learned in the Oriental and modern tongues as well as in the classical.

When their work was done, they composed a Dedication to the King which is still printed with the book. They also published an Address to the Reader, which usually is not.⁵ This is a pity, for it is a solid historical essay that reviews previous versions, from their immediate predecessors back to the Septuagint, and tells us much about their aims, standards, and limitations.

Here their style is tortuous, full of antitheses and odd metaphors, but their learning is sound, and their arguments for the necessity of translation cogent. 'Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the

shell that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtaine that we may looke into the most Holy place.'

They hint that they are doubtful how the new attempt will be received: but if it is proper to improve our translations of secular authors like Aristotle, it is proper to do the same for the Bible; and those who are bound to the old wording should remember that the King's Speech in Parliament is the King's Speech still, into whatever language it is translated.

The Tudor age in which they had grown up was an age of great translations. We have only to think of Lord Berners' *Froissart*, North's *Plutarch*, Florio's *Montaigne*, the many versions of the classics by Philemon Holland. However easily the men of the Renaissance could enjoy the resources of Greece and Rome in the original tongues, they believed that the enjoyment and instruction should be available to people who, like Shakespeare, in Ben Jonson's view, had small Latin and less Greek. The Authorized Version is the climax of that effort to do the same for Holy Writ, which had produced a version of one or other of the Testaments, or of the whole Bible, on the average once in every ten years between 1525 and 1611.

King James's Committee had neither instructions nor intention to start afresh from original texts. They were revisers rather than translators, since, as their Dedication says, the King had 'apprehended' how convenient it was

That out of the Originall sacred tongues, together with comparing of the Labours, both in our owne and other forreigne Languages of many worthy Men who went before vs, there should be one more exact Translation of the holy Scriptures into the English tongue.

They had no thought, they declare, that they would need 'to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one'.

They consulted, they tell us, 'Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greeke, Latin, Spanish, French, Italian, and Dutch' [i.e. German], and it can be shown that they did not hesitate to consult also the Calvinistic Geneva Version of 1560 and the New Testament, 1582, of the Roman Rheims-Douai Version (its Old Testament was not completed until 1609-10, too late to be of much use). But they were commissioned to depend primarily on the Bishops' Bible of 1568. This was a revision of the Great Bible of 1539-41, and that was largely based on the work of William Tyndale. It can be shown by a comparison of Tyndale's version with those of his successors that the Authorized Version contains some nine-tenths of his wording in the New Testament, and some three-quarters⁶ of it in those parts of the Old Testament that he had had time to translate before his martyr's death at Vilvorde. The Great Bible was a version of the so-called Matthew's Bible (1537) that included Tyndale's Pentateuch, a version of Joshua probably by him, and the whole of his New Testament, along with much of Miles Coverdale's Old Testament. The name 'Matthew' appears to have been a face-saving device under which the work of a 'heretic' could be published with Government approval.

The Authorized Version, therefore, goes back to Tyndale for the most part, and in a less degree to Coverdale. In that fact lies the source of its glories and defects. To Quiller-Couch⁷ it seemed a miracle that a Committee of nearly

fifty men, however scholarly, could produce a work of such literary splendour.

John Selden⁸ shows us how the Committee proceeded in its final stages:

That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in Such a Tongue . . . and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible either of the learned tongues, or *French, Spanish, Italian*, etc. if they found any fault they spoke, if not, he read on.

Of course, all the hard work had been done before this final polishing; but even so it does seem a disjointed, individualist method unlikely to result in a unified work of art, though it was an excellent way to achieve good rhythm. To a large extent the miracle was worked through Tyndale and Coverdale, whose cadences echo in the style. The Elizabethan passion for 'catching an inkhorn-term by the tail' was no part of their nature, so their language is at once plain and dignified. King James's scholars, in Q.'s words, often 'improved upon what Genius had done', but on the whole it was their outstanding virtue that they knew when to leave well alone.

On the other hand, Selden was right to point out that the Authorized Version sometimes kept too closely to the idiom of the Hebrew language. That is all very well for scholars, but 'when it comes among the Common People . . . what Gear do they make of it'. It is to be feared that what 'the Common People' did in the mid-seventeenth century their modern counterparts still do with even worse misunderstanding, since our language is also further away from Tudor English than theirs.

The scholars of the Authorized Version themselves had to consider this last problem, and bring some old expressions up to date. This was inevitable, for Tyndale was put to death in 1536 and Coverdale's complete Bible had been published in 1535. Since their day, English had changed and developed, so that by 1611 *those* had to replace *thoo*, *longer* was more familiar than *lenger*, and the archaic *brast* and *shett* gave way to *burst* and *shut*. In the same way, later editions of the Authorized Version replaced *moneth* by *month*, and *cloud* (of earth) by *clod*. Also, perhaps unfortunately, the Authorized Version revisers got rid of the homely English terms that Tyndale had used. He was more concerned with realism than afraid of anachronism, and had put 'ten grotes' instead of 'ten pieces of silver', a *parler* instead of an 'upper room', and (in the story of what happened at Lystra) 'the church porche' instead of 'the gates of the temple'. They preferred such proper words as *centurion* (Tyndale's 'hye captayne') and *Areopagus* (*Marsestrete*), though their *Euroclydon* is surely not as good as his 'flawe off wynde out of the northeeste'. For the officer and the wind they were following the Geneva text.

However strict a translator's integrity, words have atmosphere, and a man's attitude to matters of belief, the side he takes in controversy, may come out in his choice of vocabulary. Tyndale had been determined to avoid words that were tied up with theological or ecclesiastical theories. So he used *repent*, not *do penance*, *love*, not *charity*, and *congregation*, not *church* (except for the building at Lystra, which was not a church!). The modern Protestant reader will see the point of the first, be uncertain about the second, and find himself puzzled, probably, about the third.

Charity, said Sir Thomas More, is 'holy vertuous affeccyon' as distinct from

the 'lewd loue' between 'flekke and his make'⁹—that is, in more modern slang, between any guy and his moll. We are still in a difficulty here, for we remember that charity can be cold, and love too hot. Our language has not found a solution, so later translations have swung uncertainly between these two unsafe and inadequate words.

To us, *congregation* has nearly always an ecclesiastical air, so why is Tyndale willing to use it when he is not willing to use *church*? It is not that he believes in the local churches more than in the Church; it is simply that he wants to break away from the idea of the Church as Rome conceived it, and therefore chose a word that had no essentially religious associations. As More said, *congregation* could be used as properly of a company of Turks—or indeed, in the words of his biographer Nicholas Harpsfield, it no more signified 'the congregation of cristian men then a faire flocke of vnchristian geese'.¹⁰

The Authorized Version Committee had to face this problem. They stated that they had avoided 'the scrupulositie of the Puritans who leave the olde Ecclesiasticall words, and betake them to other, as when they put *washing* for *Baptisme*, and *Congregation* in stead of *Church*'. And on the other hand, they 'shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their *Azimes*, *Tunike*, *Rational*, *Holocausts* . . . whereof their late translation is full.'

The English language is no respecter of parties in controversy; not all such terms are obscure now, and there is something, too, in the Rheims translators' defence that *shew-bread* is no better than 'Breades of Proposition' until you have grown used to it.¹¹

The Authorized Version took over some striking phrases from its predecessors; they have become familiar expressions to many who could not refer them to their original context. With a sure sense of style, the revisers rejected Tyndale's correct but colourless '*multitude* of witnesses' for the literal but much more impressive *cloud*. This they may have taken from Geneva, but it is to be found in the fourteenth-century translations.¹² The '*vials of wrath*' go back to Wyclif. 'Solomon in all his glory' owes nothing to Tyndale, who had said *royalte*; the Authorized Version's phrase is that of Geneva, but it had been used in the Wycliffite translation, and appears in Reginald Peacock's *The Reule of Crysten Religioun*.¹³ There were some medieval figures in shadowy attendance at Hampton Court. From Tyndale come 'filthy lucre', 'the mark of the beast', 'the powers that be'; but Gavin Bone,¹⁴ in his essay on Tyndale's English, points out that the final sharpening of our proverbial Biblical phrases was usually done by the Authorized Version revisers. This does not mean that they always hit on the best phrasing. Obviously they are not to blame for other people's careless reading or misapplication. But if they had kept to Tyndale's 'Couetousness is the rote of all evyl', that text would not be misquoted as often as it is. 'The Scarlet Woman' became a term of virulent abuse in the seventeenth century; if the Authorized Version had stuck to Tyndale's *rose-color*, would the phrase have lent itself so well? With Tyndale, the Authorized Version tells us that Jesus said to the storm-tossed disciples, 'Be of good chere'; Rheims says, 'Have confidence', which would do as well. To the man sick of the palsy, Christ says, 'Have a good hart, sonne,' in the Rheims version, which is better still. The Authorized Version, echoing Tyndale, says, 'We never saw it on this fashion,' which has dated. Geneva had said, 'We never sawe such a thinge';

but Rheims is here best of all—short, lively, modern—with 'We never saw the like'. And what was it that so annoyed the Prodigal's elder brother? Tyndale and the Bishops' Bible say, in varied spelling, 'minstrelsy and dancing'—perhaps too medieval a touch. Geneva says, 'melodie, and dancing'; the Authorized has 'musicke and dauncing', the most modern in tone of them all—too modern, possibly. 'Licensed for Music and Dancing', say the notices . . . perhaps we should have done better with the older translators after all.

The Authorized Version rendering of the Beatitudes is almost the same as Tyndale's. The Bishops had put *satisfied*, but the Authorized Version went back to Tyndale's *filled*. In St Paul's chapter on love (or charity?) the Bishops' Bible begins 'Charitie suffereth long, and is courteous; charitie envieth not, charitie doeth not frowardly, swelleth not . . .', which sounds archaic now, and is indeed Tyndale's version with *charitie* instead of *love*. The passage ends: 'Nowe abydeyth faith, hope, and charitie, these three, but the chiefe of these is charitie.' Geneva says that 'Love . . . is bountiful . . . doth not boast it selfe: it is not puffed vp', and concludes: 'And now abideth faith, hope and love, even these three: but the chiefest of these is love'—which is Tyndale, apart from the minor detail of the illogical but emphatic *chiefest*.

The opening verses of St John's Gospel in Tyndale's 1525-6 version read: 'In the begynnyng was that worde, and that worde was with god: and god was thatt worde. The same was in the begynnynge wyth god. All thynges were made by it, and with out it, was made noo thinge, that made was. In it was lyfe, And lyfe was the light of men, And the light shyneth in darckness and darckness comprehended it not.'

In the 1534 version, partly as the result of argument with More, the passage reads as it does in the Authorized Version, except that the Word is referred to as *it*, not *he*. Here the Authorized Version has bypassed the Bishops' Bible, which is much closer to the 1525-6 rendering.

The profundities of thought behind this deceptively simple translation could occupy Christian thinkers to all eternity; but what if the Authorized Version had been a revision made in the eighteenth century, when private translations multiplied, and many people—not all—were demanding 'elegance' and 'politeness', and when it was said that 'where Mysteries begin, Religion must end'? Had George III been interested, we might have been expected to read the prologue to St John's Gospel in the style of Dr Edward Harwood, whose translation runs (or should we say *stalks*?) like this:

This exalted spirit assumed human life—and from his incarnation the most pure and sacred emanations of light were derived to illuminate mankind.

The Logos assumed human nature, and resided among us—and we were spectators of all the astonishing transactions of his life—by which he demonstrated himself to us to be the distinguished favourite of heaven.¹⁵

'The word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory. . . .'
Could any two forms of English be further apart?

The Authorized Version was fortunate indeed in its ancestry and in the time of its appearance. Above all, it was fortunate in the restraint and tact of the revisers, who could not only bring their own graces, but could also rest content with the greatness of their predecessors. Tudor-Jacobean English was a

luxuriant field, from which a writer could cull anything he liked, and it is true that the Authorized Version represents only one of the possibilities. If the revisers had made the Book in the style of their own prefatory matter, it might have been nearly as bad as Harwood's. They did not. Instead, they selected their words with skill, constructed their sentences with the nicest care, and consulted the best available authorities. They gave us a superb monument of English prose, its style as central to our literature as its content is to our Faith.¹⁶

¹ Cp. E. Cardwell, *A History of Conferences*, O.U.P., 1841, pp.130-228.

² Cp. the Report presented to the Synod of Dort in 1618. This is Document LXII in A. W. Pollard's *Records of the English Bible*, O.U.P., 1911.

³ Pollard, *op. cit.*, No. 1.

⁴ Pollard, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-53.

⁵ Quotations are from a 1611 second edition copy of the Authorized Version in the Library of the University of Bristol. Those from the Bishops' Bible are from the University's copy of 1584 and those from the Geneva from my own copy of 1603. Quotations from Tyndale's 1525/6 New Testament (the Worms octavo) are from the 1862 facsimile of the unique textually complete copy in the Library of the Bristol Baptist College. I have modernized its punctuation and expanded the contractions.

⁶ Cp. J. Isaacs in *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible* (ed. H. Wheeler Robinson), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1940, Ch. VI.

⁷ *The Art of Writing*, C.U.P., 1917, Lecture VI.

⁸ *Table-Talk*, Arber's Reprint No. 6, p.20.

⁹ Pollard, *op. cit.*, XIV.

¹⁰ *Life of More*, Early English Text Society, 186, ed. R. W. Chambers and E. V. Hitchcock, p.115.

¹¹ 'To the Right Welbeloved English Reader', prefatory to Rheims Old Testament: *shew-bread* goes back to Luther.

¹² In the Wycliffite translation and in the fourteenth-century Biblical Version, ed. A. C. Paues, C.U.P., 1904. The Vulgate, most English versions, and the modern French of Louis Second keep to the idea of a cloud. Tyndale, like versions in modern German and Icelandic, regards it as a dead metaphor.

¹³ E.E.T.S., 171, ed. W. C. Greet, p.440.

¹⁴ In S. L. Greenslade's *The Work of William Tindale*, Blackie & Son, 1938. I have used the y-spelling in accordance with the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*.

¹⁵ Quoted in the *Monthly Review* of September 1769. It is fair to add that it was intended as a paraphrase, not as a literal translation.

¹⁶ Cp. J. Isaacs, Ch. VII in the Wheeler Robinson collection of essays.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF BRITAIN

Adam Fox

IN THESE last few years there have suddenly appeared a great many translations of the Bible into English, but from before the middle of the seventeenth century until the last quarter of the nineteenth century the Authorized Version was for all intents and purposes the only one in use, with two exceptions. The Douai Version has served the purposes of the Roman Catholics, and those who use the Book of Common Prayer found, and still find, the psalms in a previous version. But the Authorized Version has been read a thousand times more frequently than any other English Bible, and, although it has its faults and deficiencies, its familiarity has brought the advantage that a preacher who quotes from it does not create the discomfort of an apparent misquotation, and in Bible study confined to an English text no questions of true or false readings will arise. Religious discussion can start on an agreed basis.

How this dominance of the Authorized Version arose cannot be certainly determined. When it appeared in 1611 it was no doubt the best translation that had yet been published, but its superiority would not be obvious or overwhelming, except to scholars. It seems likely that the privileged presses were responsible for the disappearance of the previous versions, and this would be because under Puritan influence the circulation of the Bible greatly increased, and printing many copies of the same book became more and more plainly to the printers' advantage; for it was about this time that printing became as much a business as an art. The previous versions were swamped by sheer numbers.

However that may be, the Open Bible which came into the hands of the English-speaking peoples has proved to be an institution of surpassing importance. It is difficult for us to realize what a bold experiment in liberty this Open Bible was, and perhaps those who encouraged it scarcely realized what they were doing. At the time many more people had come to be able to read, and they were people who had been accustomed to know the Scriptures only by hearing selected extracts, and those mostly very short ones, read in Church. When the readers applied their newly won skill to page after page of the Bible the impact must have been tremendous. And it is useful to remember that England experienced the impact of two great books at the same time, the Bible and the works of Shakespeare. The nation could hardly have absorbed both if they had not been so different. Shakespeare of course had predecessors in his art, but it was as yet a new art, and he was the first (and perhaps the last) to master it. The Bible on the other hand was very old and had a very special standing all its own. The clergy had studied it and expounded it in their own fashion through the centuries. What was new in the seventeenth century was

that everybody had come to study it and talk about it, and, although they were talking about a book, they were not talking about it as a book. They were talking about it as a word of life.

It has often been suggested that the exalted position of the Bible in Protestantism arose from the fact that the Protestants, having discarded one infallible authority, found themselves in need of another, if their religion was to hold together. But this may be questioned. A large section of the Reformed Church looks to Calvin, another with almost as much deference to Luther. In Britain we had no absolutely pre-eminent leader. For us Queen Elizabeth I and John Knox and Cranmer and Hooker and Cromwell and John Bunyan and John Wesley are all as good as the Pope. The pre-eminence of the Bible with us may be due to its superior excellence as a book. The English it is written in is unrivalled and of a kind that takes hold of you terribly. The matter is most original in its approach to life. It owes something also to its being the only Oriental literature to which most of us have access in a form that can get itself over. Further, a large portion of its most striking parts is poetry, which is much the most favoured of the arts in this island. A number of the psalms for example and the poetry in the story of Balaam and Balak, though in translation, are equal to the highest original English poetry.

All these advantages arise from the literary qualities of the Bible and that, of course, is only the beginning of the story. But it is the beginning, for if a book is not read with delight, it will certainly not be universally read. The Bible in English is read with delight, and when it has been read a shift must inevitably be made from delight to God Himself. It cannot possibly be otherwise. The Bible is so far from being just literature, however good, that it comes not to be thought of as literature at all. It is all wisdom, morality, and the life of the world to come.

Except in the mission field, the Bible has until quite recently been ordinarily bound up and circulated as a whole, and in the Lectionary attached to the Book of Common Prayer from 1549 to 1870 it was read through whole chapter by whole chapter with hardly any omission at all. This produced several effects. In the first place, all parts of it have tended to have equal honour, and the Old Testament has often been quoted with the commendation that 'this is what the Bible says,' and without the reservation that it is pre-Christian, and that God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son. The Old Testament morality, because it is so forcibly and vividly presented, has often been accepted as of absolute validity. Its notions of the wrath of God, of a chosen people, of the laws of property have tended to remain static in the British way of life instead of being transformed by the Spirit of Christ. Then, when they are no longer appropriate as they stand, they have come to be laid on one side with the result that the nation as a whole has no notion on these and other matters on which it is most important to have right notions. It is a recent gain that the Old and New Testaments are now more often set in their proper relation to one another, and the Old Testament is seen as the preparation of men's minds for the reception of the Gospel of Christ.

A second effect of having the whole Bible is that thoughtful readers simply lay aside what does not come home to them and concentrate on the parts they

understand and can make use of. It is often done unconsciously and does not preclude maintaining the view that everything in the Bible is true. This is by a process of the mind which is easy and very common. If I commend my country for its virtues, I am probably very well aware of many failures in these particular virtues, but they 'don't count'. If I fancy I was at a good school, the bad boys (now grown into bad men) 'don't count'. In literature I claim (quite rightly) to judge my favourite author by his best work only; the rest 'doesn't count'. And similarly it is what we love and understand in the Bible that *is* the Bible; the rest 'doesn't count', it may be Leviticus or Ecclesiastes or even the Epistle of St James which Luther called an epistle of straw, or, more exactly, 'a right strawy epistle'. He printed James, Jude, Hebrews and Revelation at the end of the German Bible, really for no other reason than that he did not like them, so they 'don't count'. It must be by a similar mental process that many Roman Catholics put on one side the veneration of relics which are patently unauthentic; that kind of devotion 'doesn't count'.

Such reservations are perfectly normal in all walks of life. They are the only way to make associated action possible. But they raise the question as to what is meant by saying that 'the Bible is true'. In some sense or other all Christians are committed to saying it, and the interpretation of it in its extreme form has led to very odd beliefs and practices and superstitions, as for example that, if one seeks for guidance, one has only to open the Bible at random and the chance (or say the providential) page will provide the necessary enlightenment, even when the finger may have to be put blindly on the relevant verse. But ultimately the Bible is held to be true because it does point the reader to the best course of action and the best way of life far more fully and far more clearly than anything else we ever read. There is a unique power in it, and that power loses nothing in translation into English. All this is more than human: it is inspired.

The main influence of the Bible read in church was in teaching lessons of morality which were shared by a large part of the nation. This created a common moral opinion which made it easier to stand for the right than now, when the growth of population has outstripped the spread of Christian knowledge. Naboth's vineyard taught one what to avoid; the parable of the Publican and the Sinner taught one what to avoid and what to do; the story of the Widow's Mite taught one what to do; but these allusions are no longer commonplaces. Familiarity with the Bible also helped the preacher if the congregation already knew the passage from which he had taken his text, or if his biblical quotations were familiar, for familiar quotations in a sermon have ten times the effect of new ones.

For the last 200 years a very remarkable effect of the Bible upon the religious life of the country can be seen in the character of our hymns. Hymn-singing has become the principal part of congregational worship, quite eclipsing the responses and litanies which, together with one or two popular sacred songs (for such the old hymns were), was all that could be allotted to the people before printing made hymn-books cheap. The old notion of a hymn was something platitudinous and dogmatic with vague reference to the better-known narrative events in the New Testament or the lives of the saints. This suited the Latin language, and survived and still survives in English. But the range of modern hymns has been wonderfully extended by the introduction of detailed teaching

and particular texts from the Bible. We have, for example, the 23rd Psalm in several attractive forms, not superseding the version in the Psalter, but presenting it in a more pointed fashion. In the hymn which begins with the words 'At the name of Jesus, Every knee shall bow' we have a passage of very great doctrinal importance from St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (2₅₋₁₁) made much simpler, and with a charm which compensates for an inevitable loss of depth and precision. Until recently it was the practice to put a text from the Bible at the head of every hymn; sometimes this was illuminating, sometimes less apposite, but at least it served to show that hymns are intended to be scriptural. The practice was probably dropped because a number of hymns have crept in of which this could hardly be said, more's the pity.

But the influence of the Bible in the church has probably been surpassed by its influence in the home, when there was customarily a family Bible and most members of the family would have one of their own as well. The family Bible was often of the proportions of a lectern Bible. In olden days it was often called the 'hall Bible', as being in the principal room, and its fly-leaves and spare pages were used to record the births, baptisms, marriages, and deaths in the family. The same volume often persisted through many generations. It also served for the family prayers which sanctified so many households. Burns has given the classic description in 'The Cottar's Saturday Night':

*The cheerful Supper done, wi' serious face,
They, round the ingle, form a circle wide:
The sire turns o'er wi' patriarchal grace,
The big ha'-Bible, ance his Father's pride.
His bonnet rev'rently is laid aside. . . .*

but we need not follow him further, as he leads a metrical psalm to which 'they chant their artless notes'.

Many have testified to the value of these family prayers, scarcely surviving anywhere in England now. One curious by-product of them, described inimitably as 'a picture where Philology and Piety go hand in hand' (*Three Friends*, Robert Bridges, O.U.P., 1932, p.152) deserves to be reproduced. It is an anecdote of Henry Bradley, the second Editor of the *New English Dictionary*:

The earliest record of Henry is singularly characteristic. It was before he was four years old, on the occasion of his being taken for the first time to church—the meeting-house, no doubt, of the Congregational community to which his parents belonged—when he obstinately persisted in holding his book upside-down. This eccentricity gave some anxiety, until it was discovered that the child really could read, but only with the book in that position. Unknown to them he had taught himself during family prayers: while his father, sitting with a great Bible on his knees, was reading the lesson aloud, the boy, standing in front of him closely poring over the page, had followed word by word and thus worked out the whole puzzle—and so completely, that long after he had accustomed himself to the normal position he could read equally well either way.¹

It must be admitted that the Open Bible has been to a large extent responsible for the numerous sects which have adorned and disfigured English-speaking Christianity. There is nothing like the Bible for putting ideas into a man's head,

and when one idea puts the rest into the background, or as he would say, into their right place, then he comes to think he has really got hold of Christianity: then he gets to work and creates a system round his one idea. This means a simplification of established and conventional religion; it is easier to preach and easier to grasp. It is true it is not a catholic faith, that is to say a faith for all men: it only appeals to men of a certain temperament. But it gives more scope for enthusiasm than the established every day religion, which is apt to seem and often to be humdrum. It is generally a prophetic as opposed to a priestly religion. At first it is not usually attractive to the learned or the theologically minded, and believes itself not to have much use for the services of such people.

One can see why a Church which thinks a strong discipline desirable is inclined to deprecate the Open Bible a little. We have recently been told from Westminster Cathedral that 'the Church is the custodian of the morals of her children'. But the inhabitants of this island will for the most part have none of this, perhaps too rashly. They would allow that the Bible is the keeper of their conscience.

In 1881 under the most favourable auspices the 'Revised Version' of the Holy Scriptures was produced. It cannot be said that it has had a very warm welcome from the nation at large. Even scholars have always been dubious about it. In one College at Oxford one of the Fellows who was a great Hebrew scholar insisted that the Old Testament ought to be read in chapel in the Revised Version; another Fellow, almost equally famous, but as a liturgical scholar, insisted that the New Testament must not be read in the Revised Version. 'They didn't do what they were told,' he said. Nor did they. The Revisers of the New Testament first of all established a new Greek text, which they were not asked to do, and they did it under the influence of Westcott and Hort, whose principles of criticism are now by no means unquestioned. They also had rather pedantic notions of always representing any particular Greek word by one particular word in English, which is an uncommonly difficult thing to do and in this case impossible to do successfully. In recent years a number of translations have been made on the assumption, more or less true, that the Authorized Version is antiquated. It is much to be hoped that one of these new versions will prove to be so superior to the rest, and for general purposes so superior to the Authorized Version, that it will come to be what people mean when they talk about 'the Bible'. *Prosit Omen.*

¹ The extract from *Three Friends* is printed with the kind permission of Lord Bridges.

THE LITERARY IMPACT OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION*

C. S. Lewis

THE BIBLE has been read for almost every purpose more diligently than for literary pleasure. Yet certain *testimonia* to it even on that score can be collected from earlier ages.

The oldest literary appreciation that I know is also the most modern in tone. When Longinus¹ praises the author of Genesis—in his language, 'the lawgiver of the Jews'—for sublimity of conception, he seems to express a literary experience very like our own. Genesis is placed beside Homer and in some respects preferred to him. The Bible is being ranked among the classics on purely secular grounds. But it would be difficult to cite strict parallels from the ages that follow.

The learned M. de Bruyne, in his *Études d'esthétique médiévale* (1946) has collected a mass of evidence about the literary appreciation of Scripture in the Middle Ages. Praise is not lacking; but we certainly find ourselves in an alien world. On the threshold of that period we meet St Augustine's curious statement that the Bible uses *humillimum genus loquendi*.² If this referred to style in the narrower sense, if the Psalms and Prophets seemed to him to use 'the lowest language', it would be almost inexplicable. Almost, but not quite; the great roaring machine of Latin rhetoric can, at times, deafen the human ear to all other literature. But from the context I suppose that St Augustine is referring to something rather different—to that apparent *naïveté*; or simplicity of the literal sense which offended him until he had been taught that it was merely the outer shell, concealing the *sacramentorum altitudo*.³ This distinction between the literal or historical sense and the allegorical senses—however these are classified by different doctors—is a fundamental factor in all medieval reading of the Bible. It is no doubt true, and must be insisted on, that no superstructure of allegories was allowed to abrogate the truth of the literal sense. Hugo of St Victor urges upon his pupils the necessity of mastering the literal sense first. 'I think', he writes, 'you will never be perfectly subtle in the Allegory unless you are first grounded in the History.'⁴ Yet this very passage reveals how inevitably the medieval exegesis belittled what we should regard as the actual literary quality of the text. It is clear that Hugo expects his pupils to hurry through the historical sense too quickly and perfunctorily. *Noli contemnere minima haec*,⁵ he adds, 'Despise not these small things'. If you had despised the alphabet you would not now be able to read. An appreciation for which the story of Joseph and his brethren or David and Goliath was merely the alphabet, a necessary preliminary to higher and more delightful studies, may have been keen, but it was very unlike our own. Hence we are not surprised to find him saying that the Scriptures are like a honeycomb. They appear dry on the

* Abridged from *The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version*, by permission of the Athlone Press.

outside *per simplicitatem sermonis*, but are *dulcedine plena* within.⁶ Notice how the *simplicitas sermonis* echoes St Augustine's *humillimum genus loquendi*. Again, the Scripture may be compared to a lyre. The spiritual senses are like the strings: the historical sense is like the wood which does not sound itself but keeps the strings together.⁷

Thomas Aquinas throws a little more light on the references which we have already met to the 'lowness' or 'simplicity' of the Bible. He explains why Scripture expresses divine truths not merely through corporeal images but even through images of vile bodies rather than noble.⁸ This is done, he says, to liberate the mind from error, to reduce the danger of any confusion between the symbol and the reality. It is an answer worthy of a profound theologian. At the same time, the passage in which it occurs reveals attitudes most hostile to aesthetic appreciation of the sacred text. It would seem, he says, that Scripture ought not to use metaphors. For what is proper to the lowest kind of learning (*infimae doctrinae*) does not seem suitable to the queen of the sciences. But metaphor is proper to poetry, and poetry is the lowest of all forms of learning—*est infima inter omnes doctrinas*. The answer, as far as it concerns us here, is that poetry and Scripture use metaphor for quite different reasons; poetry for delight and Scripture *propter necessitatem et utilitatem*.⁹ Where a nineteenth-century critic might have said that Scripture was itself the highest poetry, Aquinas says rather that the highest and the lowest *doctrinae* have, paradoxically, one point in common, but, of course, for different reasons.

From other medieval writers, notably Ulric of Strasbourg, de Bruyne has collected passages which seem, but perhaps not without illusion, to come nearer to the modern point of view.

If the medieval approach is alien, that of the Renaissance seems to me sometimes repellent. We reach the age of Ciceronianism, of Humanism, of that deadly classical dignity which so obscured and distorted (along with many other things) the classics themselves. Where an aesthetic like this prevailed, the simple grandeur of *Kings* and *Judges* and the Gospels had little chance of being valued at its true worth. Hence Vida thought that the story of the Passion could be improved by the tinsel of his *Christiad*.

With the first Protestant translators we get some signs of a changed approach. I would wish to take every precaution against exaggerating it. The history of the English Bible from Tyndale to the Authorized Version should never for long be separated from that European, and by no means exclusively Protestant, movement of which it made part.

Tyndale accepts corrections from More: Rheims learns from Geneva: phrases travel through Rheims on their way from Geneva to Authorized. Willy-nilly, all Christendom collaborates. The English Bible is the English branch of a European tree.

Yet in spite of this there is something new about Tyndale; for good or ill, a great simplification of approach. 'Scripture', he writes, 'speaketh after the most grossest manner. Be diligent therefore that thou be not deceived with curiousness.'¹⁰ In the words 'grossest manner' we recognize an echo of Augustine's *humillimum genus* and Hugo of St Victor's *simplicitas sermonis*. That rusticity or meanness which we find it so hard to discern in the Bible is

still apparent to Tyndale. The novelty is the rejection of the allegorical senses. That rejection he shares with most of the Reformers and even, as regards parts of the Bible, with a Humanistic Papist like Colet. What is interesting is not Tyndale's negation of the allegories, but his positive attitude towards the literal sense. He loves it for its 'grossness'. 'God is a Spirit', he writes, 'and all his words are spiritual. His literal sense is spiritual.'¹¹ That is very characteristic of Tyndale's outlook.

It is not, of course, to be supposed that aesthetic considerations were uppermost in Tyndale's mind when he translated Scripture. The matter was much too serious for that; souls were at stake. The same holds for all the translators. Coverdale was probably the one whose choice of a rendering came nearest to being determined by taste. Of all the translators he was the least scholarly. This gave him a kind of freedom. Unable to judge between rival interpretations, taste may often have guided him, half-consciously, to select and combine. Fortunately, his taste was admirable.

The history of the Authorized Version has been told so often that I will not attempt to re-tell it, and its beauties praised so lavishly that I will not praise them. Instead, I will proceed at once to its influence as an English book. I shall attempt to define that influence, for I think there has been misunderstanding about it and even a little exaggeration.

Let us begin by distinguishing the various senses in which one book can be said to influence the author of another book.

(1) A book may be, in the familiar language of research, a *source*. Lydgate mentions the loves of Mars and Venus. The immediate source might be some book like Boccaccio's *De Genealogia*, the ultimate source is Homer. It would, I think, be quite good English to say that Lydgate was here influenced by Homer. But that is not the most useful way of employing the word in literary history, nor is it generally so employed. If anyone wishes to call a Source an Influence, let him do so; but let him recognize a Source as a very special kind of Influence. Most of us, I expect, would prefer to distinguish Source from Influence altogether. A Source gives us things to write about; an Influence prompts us to write in a certain way. Homer is a Source to Lydgate, but Homer was an Influence on Arnold when he wrote *Sohrab and Rustum*. Firdausi's *Shah Nameh* was Arnold's Source, but not an Influence on that poem.

If these terms are accepted, we can distinguish the Bible as a Source for English Literature from the Bible as a literary Influence. That it is a Source of immense importance is obvious. For several centuries its persons, scenes, and doctrines were familiar to every Englishman. They are constantly used for illustration and allusion. But, of course, when the Bible is a Source, there is usually nothing to show whether the Authorized Version is being used or not. The Bible is one Source for Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, but his spelling of Achitophel's name is not derived from the Authorized. We may indeed assume that most authors, and all unlearned authors, after the sixteenth century derived their Biblical knowledge from that version. But this does not seem to be a fact of any importance. The persons and stories would be the same in whatever text they were known. On my view the huge mass of Biblical material in our literature has no place in an account of the Influence of the Authorized Version considered as an English book.

(2) It would, I suppose, be possible, to say that we are influenced by a book whenever we quote it; but probably no literary historian would wish to use the word *influence* in that way. If English literature is full of Biblical quotation, I would not describe this as the influence of the Authorized Version, any more than I would call Virgilians all those who quote Virgil. I am not saying that to do otherwise would be necessarily an improper use of language: I only think mine more useful for the purpose in hand.

(3) So far I have been speaking of what may be called flagrant quotation—quotation isolated and proclaimed by typographical devices. But besides this there is the embedded quotation—sentences or phrases from the Authorized Version artfully worked into an author's own language so that an ignorant reader might not recognize them. Our literature is full of this, especially in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; in Trollope, Swinburne, and Kipling it becomes a positive nuisance; one contemporary American professor is very seriously infected. To this process the word *Influence* might much more naturally be applied. Yet even this does not seem to me to be *Influence* in the deepest sense, and I would prefer not to call it *Influence* at all. I will try to explain why.

Let us begin by laying side by side with it two other phenomena of the same sort: the ubiquitous embedded quotations from Homer in Plato's prose, or from Shakespeare in English prose. The scraps of Homer slip very artfully in and out of the orchestration of a Platonic period. But, of course, they are all marked out from their surroundings by their metre and their dialect. They would not be doing their work unless they were felt to be different from the Attic prose that surrounds them. They are used either for solemnity or facetiously—and the facetious is only the solemn stood on its head. The very response they demand depends on our feeling them as aliens. There would be no point in them unless we did. Far from showing that Plato's style has assimilated Homer's, they show the irreducible difference between them. And are not the embedded Shakespearian quotations in English the same? Of course, not every hack who speaks of a man more sinned against than sinning, or a consummation devoutly to be wished, knows that he is quoting Shakespeare. He may think (significantly) that he is quoting the Bible. He may even think he is using a proverb. But he knows quite well, and he expects his readers to know, that he is borrowing from somewhere. He wants the phrase to stand out from his own composition as gold lace stands out from a coat. The whole pleasure, such as it is, depends on the fact that the embedded quotation is different—in other words, that his own style is not influenced by Shakespeare.

I believe that our embedded quotations from the Authorized Version are nearly always in exactly this position. They are nearly always either solemn or facetious. Only because the surrounding prose is different—in other words, only in so far as our English is not influenced by the Authorized Version—do they achieve the effect the authors intended.

(4) Here at last we reach what I would describe as *Influence* in the full and strict sense—the influence of the Authorized Version on vocabulary. I do not think we are being (in this sense) influenced by Shakespeare when we speak of a consummation devoutly to be wished. But I do think we are influenced by him (though the phonetic history is complicated) whenever we use *weird* as

an adjective. We do so with no sense of quotation: the word has been really assimilated, has gone into the blood-stream of our language. In the same way we are being influenced by the Authorized Version and its predecessors whenever we use the words *beautiful*, *long-suffering*, *peace-maker* or *scapegoat*. But even here I must plead for a distinction. Henry Bradley rightly mentioned *damsel*, *raiment*, *travail*, and *quick* in the sense 'alive', as words saved by the Authorized Version for archaic and poetical use. But only for such use. They are not in the blood-stream. As for *loving-kindness* and *tender mercies*, they are so generally confined either to religious contexts or to mockery (which for our special purpose tells the same tale) that I almost classify them as very short embedded quotations.

(5) Finally, we come to literary influence in the fullest sense, the sense it bears when we say that *Paradise Lost* is influenced by Homer and Virgil, or nineteenth-century journalism by Macaulay or modern English poetry by Mr Eliot. You will perhaps remember that I have defined Influence, in this sense, as that which prompts a man to write in a certain way. But even within this definition further distinctions break out. The influence may show itself in architectonics. That is the most obvious, though by no means the only, manner in which Virgil influences Milton. The whole plan of his epic is Virgilian. Very few English writers have undergone an influence of that sort from any book of the Bible. Tupper's *Proverbial Philosophy* and the *Book of Mormon* are perhaps instances. Some would add Blake's *Prophetic Books*. Again, Influence may show itself in the use of language—in the rhythm, the imagery, or (using that word in its narrowest sense) the style.

The influence of the rhythms of the Authorized Version seems to me to be very hard to detect. Its rhythms are in fact extremely various, and some of them are unavoidable in the English language. I am not at all sure that a resemblance in rhythm, unless supported by some other resemblance, is usually recognizable. If I say, 'At the regatta Madge avoided the river and the crowd', would this, without warning, remind you of 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth'? I believe that wherever an English writer seems to us to recall the Scriptural rhythms, he is always recalling other associations as well.

In imagery I suppose the influence to be very great, though I must frankly confess that I have not been able to invent a method of checking it. If English writers in elevated contexts tend to speak of corn and wine rather than of beef and beer, of chariots rather than chargers, of rain rather than sunshine as a characteristic blessing, of sheep more often than cows and of the sword more often than either the pike or the gun, I suspect that this is due to the Bible, but I have no rigorous proof. Nor, in this sphere, would it be easy to distinguish the biblical influence from that generally Mediterranean and ancient influence which comes from the classics as well as the Bible. But I believe the biblical influence is here very great.

But in our style, in the actual build of our sentences, I think the influence has been less than we suppose. The perfect example of an influence in this field is that exercised on our prose by Dryden and his contemporaries (Tillotson and the like). You remember that he went all through the *Essay on Dramatic Poesy* and altered every sentence that ended with a preposition. That is, I say, a perfect

example of Influence. No one can pretend that this curious taboo was inherent in the genius of the language and would have developed even without the action of Dryden and his fellow Gallicists. On the contrary, it is so alien from the language that it has never penetrated into the conversation of even the worst prigs. It is, very precisely, a thing that prompts us to write in a certain way: even I, who detest it for a frenchified schoolroom superstition, often feel it plucking at my elbow. I doubt whether the Authorized Version has achieved any comparable dominance over our style. Indeed, what astonishes me here is the failure of some of its most familiar terms to get into our language at all. *It came to pass, answered and said, lo*—have these ever been used by any English writer without full consciousness that he was quoting? If we look into those authors who are usually said to be influenced by the style of the Authorized Version, we shall find that such influence is indeed present, but that it is hardly dominant. I will consider Ruskin and Bunyan.

In Ruskin embedded quotations and imagery from the Bible are made great use of, but Homer and Spenser are used not very much less, Dante not infrequently. And all these are used consciously. What Ruskin tells us in *Praeterita*¹² about the formation of his own style is relevant:

Had it not been for constant reading of the Bible, I might probably have taken Johnson for my model of English. To a useful extent I have always done so; in these first essays, partly because I could not help it, partly of set, and well set, purpose. . . . The turns and returns of reiterated *Rambler* and iterated *Idler* fastened themselves in my ears and mind: nor was it possible for me, till long afterwards, to quit myself of Johnsonian symmetry, in sentences intended either with swordsman's or paviour's blow, to cleave an enemy's crest or drive down the oaken pile of a principle.

In his mature style—in this very passage—I think we can recognize the Johnsonian element: I cannot recognize the biblical. Elsewhere, though I do not deny its presence—and specially in the images—it is one of many resources. I think *resources* is the best word. It is, so to speak, one of the colours in his paint-box, used at his own discretion. He has many others. And what makes the total effect, for me, so very unlike the Authorized Version, is the periodic structure of Ruskin's prose. Already in the passage quoted, which is familiar and epistolary compared with the high passages in *Modern Painters* or *Stones of Venice*, you will have noticed the transition, *nor was it possible*. That is learned from classical Latin. And so, in the long run, is the Ruskinian period as a whole. A structure descending from Cicero through the prose of Hooker, Milton, and Taylor, and then enriched with romantic colouring for which Homer and the Bible are laid under contribution—that seems to me the formula for Ruskin's style. If you could take away what comes from the Bible it would be impaired. It would hardly, I think, be crippled. It would certainly not be annihilated.

Bunyan, at first sight, will strike most of us as far more biblical than Ruskin. But this impression is partly due to the fact that both are to us rather archaic and rather simple in syntax. To that extent any unlearned author of Bunyan's time would be bound to remind us of the Bible whether he had ever read it or not. We must discount that accidental similarity and look deeper. I take an example at random:

So *Mistrust* and *Timorous* ran down the hill, and Christian went on his way. But thinking again of what he heard from the men, he felt in his bosom for his Roll, that he might read therein and be comforted: but he felt, and found it not. Then was Christian in great distress, and knew not what to do, for he wanted that which used to relieve him, and that which should have been his pass into the Celestial City. Here therefore he began to be much perplexed and knew not what to do. At last he be-thought that he had slept in the Arbour.

The question is not how much of this might occur in the Authorized Version, but how much might be expected to occur in Bunyan if he had not read it. Much of it, of course is quite unlike the Bible; phrases like *Then was Christian in great distress, he wanted that which used to relieve him, Here therefore he began to be much perplexed*. There remain *he went on his way, he felt and found it not*, and the use of *so* to introduce a new step in a narrative. These are in the manner of the Authorized Version—though this use of *so* is not very common there and is far commoner in Malory. But I do not feel at all certain that Bunyan is deriving them from his Bible. And if we look through his work we shall find that his best and most characteristic sentences often have a very unscriptural ring:

But the man, not at all discouraged, fell to cutting and hacking most fiercely.

So I looked up in my Dream and saw the clouds rack at an unusual rate, upon which I heard a great sound of a Trumpet. . . .

Why, he objected against Religion itself; he said it was a pitiful low, sneaking business for a man to mind Religion.

Some also have wished that the next way to their Father's house were here, that they might be troubled no more with either Hills or Mountains to go over: but the way is the way, and there's an end.

At last he came in, and I will say that for my Lord, he carried it wonderful lovingly to him. There were but a few good bits at the Table but some of it was laid upon his Trencher.

Such passages seem to me the essential Bunyan. His prose comes to him not from the Authorized Version, but from the fireside, the shop, and the lane. He is as native as Malory or Defoe. The Scriptural images themselves take on a new homeliness in these surroundings: 'She said she was sent for to go to her Husband: and then she up and told us how she had seen him in a dream dwelling in a curious place among Immortals, wearing a Crown, playing upon a Harp.' The Crown and Harp come no doubt from the Apocalypse, but the rest of the sentence comes from Bedfordshire, and in their village setting they are somehow transformed. Just so his Delectable Mountains are Bedfordshire hills magnified, green to the top. Without the Bible he would not have written *The Pilgrim's Progress* at all, for his mind would have been utterly different; but its style might have been much the same without the Authorized Version.

If I am right in thinking that the Authorized Version as a strictly literary influence has mattered less than we have often supposed, it may be asked how I account for the fact. I think there are two explanations.

In the first place, we must not assume that it always gave so much literary pleasure as it did in the nineteenth century. Thanks to Professor Sutherland, most of us now know about the egregious Edward Harwood, who in 1768 published his *Liberal Translation of the New Testament: Being an Attempt to*

translate the Sacred Writings with the same Freedom, Spirit and Elegance With which other English Translations of the Greek Classics have lately been executed. Harwood wrote to substitute 'the elegance of modern English' for the 'bald and barbarous language of the old vulgar version'. And no doubt Harwood was, by our standards, an ass. But can he have been the only one of his kind? Or does he voice a widely spread feeling which only reverence concealed? 'Bald and barbarous', lacking in elegance . . . we have heard something not quite unlike this before: 'the most grossest manner', *simplicitas sermonis, humillimum genus loquendi*. It is not a charge anyone would be likely to bring against the Authorized Version or its originals today. Those who dislike Scripture are now more likely to call its style florid or inflated; those who like it would praise it for sublimity. When and how did this change occur?

The answer, I suggest, is that the modern approach, or what was till lately the modern approach, to the Bible is deeply influenced by the Romantic Movement; by which I here mean not the Lake Poets, but that taste for the primitive and the passionate which can be seen growing through nearly the whole of the eighteenth century. The men who were engaged in exhuming the ballads, the Elder Edda, the Sagas, the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Kalevala*, the forgers of *Otranto* and *Ossian*, those who dreamed of bards and druids, must have heard the Bible with new ears. The primitive simplicity of a world in which kings could be shepherds, the abrupt and mysterious manner of the prophets, the violent passions of Bronze Age fighting men, the background of tents and flocks and desert and mountain, the village homeliness of our Lord's parables and metaphors, now first, I suspect, became a positive literary asset. The 'vile bodies' which St Thomas had to explain were no longer felt to be vile. Something of the same sort was happening to Homer. Scaliger had found him low. Chapman had revered him for his hidden wisdom. With Pope's preface we reach a different attitude.

I would not be as delicate [he says] as those modern critics who are shocked at the servile offices and mean employments in which we sometimes see the heroes of Homer engaged. There is a pleasure in taking a view of that simplicity, in opposition to the luxury of succeeding ages; in beholding monarchs without their guards, princes tending their flocks, and princesses drawing water from the springs.

He significantly adds that he has admitted into his version 'several of those general phrases and manners of expression which have attained a veneration even in our language from being used in the Old Testament'.

I suggest, then, that until the Romantic taste existed the Authorized Version was not such an attractive model as we might suppose. That would be one cause limiting its influence. The second cause was, I believe, its familiarity.

This may sound paradoxical, but it is seriously meant. For three centuries the Bible was so well known that hardly any word or phrase, except those which it shared with all English books whatever, could be borrowed without recognition. If you echoed the Bible everyone knew that you were echoing the Bible. And certain associations were called up in every reader's mind; sacred associations. All your readers had heard it read, as a ritual or almost ritual act, at home, at school, and in church. This did not mean that reverence prevented all Biblical echoes. It did mean that they would only be used either

with conscious reverence or with conscious irreverence, either religiously or facetiously. There could be a pious use and a profane use: but there could be no ordinary use. Nearly all that was Biblical was recognizably Biblical, and all that was recognized was *sacer*, numinous; whether on that account to be respected or on that account to be flouted, makes very little difference. Mark what Boswell says under 'Sat. April 3d 1773':

He [*sc.* Dr Johnson] disapproved of introducing scripture phrases into secular discourses. This seemed to me a question of some difficulty. A scripture expression may be used like a highly classical phrase to produce an instantaneous strong impression.

'Like a highly classical phrase'—that is the point; and producing a strong impression. It is difficult to conceive conditions less favourable to that unobtrusive process of infiltration by which a profound literary influence usually operates. An influence which cannot evade our consciousness will not go very deep.

¹ *Dr Sublim.*, IX.

² *Conf.*, VI. v.

³ *Eruditionis Didascalicae*, VI. iii.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.* IV.i.

⁷ *Ibid.* V.ii.

⁸ *Summa Theol. Quaest.*, I, Art. IX.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ 'Parable of the Wicked Mammon', in *Doctrinal Treatises*, ed. H. Walter (Cambridge, 1848), p. 59.

¹¹ 'Obedience of a Christian Man', *ibid.* p. 309.

¹² XII.

HOW THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE WAS MADE

G. S. Duncan

OUR REFORMATION forefathers firmly believed that they had an obligation to give the Bible to the people in a language which they could read and understand. A similar obligation, in a new form, has challenged the Church in the twentieth century, for the language of that earlier period is no longer the familiar language of today; and a recognition of this need has led one scholar after another to translate the Bible, or parts of it, into modern English. But just as in 1611 a further stage was reached with the issue of what came to be known as the Authorized Version, so in our time the demand has grown for a new English version which shall have some sort of official status and sanction; and this year, precisely 350 years after the appearance of the Authorized Version, we have the first part (the New Testament) of The New English Bible, planned and directed by representatives of Churches and Bible Societies in Great Britain and Ireland.

The initiative for this work came from the Church of Scotland. The prime mover, whose name ought to be recalled with special honour, was the Rev. George S. Hendry (at that time a minister of the Church of Scotland at Bridge of Allan, near Stirling, and now a Professor at Princeton), well-known to many by his books *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* and *The Gospel of the Incarnation*. Fully convinced that a new translation, enjoying official recognition, would be a great asset to the Church in its task of meeting present-day needs, and confirmed in his ideas by consultation with leading churchmen and scholars throughout Britain, Mr Hendry persuaded the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane (of which he was a member) to present an Overture on the subject to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May 1946. When the Assembly met, he spoke with such cogency in support of his plea that a committee was appointed (with himself as convener) to investigate the matter further. It was obvious that, if such a new translation was to be undertaken, it ought to be done in conjunction with other British Churches, and so an approach was made (in the first instance) to the Church of England, the Methodist Church, the Baptist Union, and the Congregational Union. At a conference of delegates appointed by these bodies, it was found that there was general agreement, not only on the desirability of a completely new translation, but also on the principles on which it should be based. The way was now open for the various Church authorities to give official approval to the scheme. Other Churches, together with the British and Foreign Bible Society and the National Bible Society of Scotland, agreed to participate. A joint-committee, on which representatives were present from all these bodies, was established to direct and carry out the work; it held its first meeting in July 1947, and has continued to meet twice yearly. Its first chairman was the Bishop of Truro (Dr J. W. Hunkin); and on

his death in 1950 his place was taken by the present Bishop of Winchester (Dr A. T. P. Williams). The Rev. G. S. Hendry was the inevitable choice as first secretary; and after his departure for America he was succeeded by another Church of Scotland representative, the Rev. Professor J. K. S. Reid of Leeds. At an early meeting it was decided to entrust the publication of the work to the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses, which have since then met the very heavy expenses involved in the work of preparation. It is now almost fourteen years since the work was begun; and it may well be five more years before it is completed.

Three translation panels have been at work, one for the Old Testament, one for the New Testament, and one for the Apocrypha; and to ensure a high standard of English there is also a panel of literary advisers. Our procedure on the New Testament panel has been that one member undertook, on request, to submit a first draft-translation of a book or a number of books; and the panel, meeting for three or four days, perhaps four times a year, went over this draft verse by verse, and was perhaps able at one meeting to deal with anything from five to ten chapters. The translation-panel's version was then submitted to the literary panel, whose suggested improvements came back for confirmation to the translators; and it was an accepted principle that on matters of English the last word lay with the literary panel, provided that the translation panel was satisfied that what was proposed represented fully the sense of the original. The process might be criticized as being unduly cumbrous; it has certainly lengthened the time spent on the work, and one thinks by contrast of the unfettered ease with which individual translators, such as James Moffatt, Ronald Knox, or J. B. Phillips, have been able to carry out their task. But there have been undoubted compensations; and as one of the translators I am very appreciative of the valuable help we received throughout from our colleagues of the literary panel. Panel members have worked as a team; no part of the work is to be associated with the name of an individual contributor. But it is right that tribute should be paid to the outstanding service rendered to the New Testament panel by its convener, Professor C. H. Dodd, who, in addition to his great gifts as a biblical scholar and as a master of English prose, brought to his task an initiative, a fair-mindedness, and a shrewdness of judgement which made his presence as our leader quite invaluable. Professor Dodd has given unsparingly of his time and energies to this new translation ever since the work began; and, apart from his work on the New Testament panel, he is general director for the work as a whole and vice-chairman of the joint-committee.

It was urged from the first, and this plea was endorsed by the decision of the Churches and of the joint-committee, that what was wanted was not a mere revision of the Authorized Version (A.V.), but an entirely new translation in the language of the twentieth century. This important and far-reaching decision served at once to put the proposed new translation in a different category from the Revised Standard Version (R.S.V.), which was then being prepared in America. For the R.S.V. (which has been published since then, and has achieved wide circulation both in this country and in America) is quite definitely a revision of the earlier American Standard Version of 1901, which in turn was based on the Authorized Version of 1611. In taking action along this line, the Churches of the United States and of Canada accepted it as desirable not merely

(a) to get rid of outworn modes of expression, and (b) to embody the best results of modern scholarship as to the meaning of the Scriptures, but also (c) to preserve as far as possible 'those qualities which have given to the King James Version a supreme place in English literature'. The New English Bible (N.E.B.) is at one with the R.S.V. in regard to the first two of those aims, but it differs from it fundamentally in regard to the third. For the N.E.B. is in no way tied to the A.V., except in so far as they both go back to the original Greek; its clearly defined aim is to render the Bible in the language of our own day. The question had at one time been raised of possible co-operation in the preparation of the two versions; but the essential difference in their aims ruled this out as impracticable.

There are undoubtedly those to whom the very thought of such a new version of the Scriptures, prepared with official approval, will be positively unwelcome. Familiar as they are with the vocabulary and the cadences of the A.V., their first reaction will be that they see no need for it, and that in any case 'the old is better'. But it is always possible to 'hear, and not understand'; familiarity with the language of the 1611 version may become an almost fatal barrier to an appreciation of what the Bible has to say to us today. And the new translation will have accomplished at least one of its aims if it provokes intelligent Church members to 'sit up' and listen with rapt attention to the message of Scripture—as if it had been written, not long centuries ago, but in our own day and for our own day, and they were being privileged (like the crowd in Jerusalem on the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit) to hear in their own tongue the wonderful works of God.

But the main purpose of the new translation is to be of service to those for whom the Bible, so far as they know it at all, has little or no appeal. In a document issued by the Church of Scotland representatives in 1946 there are two sentences which it may be of interest in this connexion to recall.

To those of our people, especially of the younger generation, who have not had more than an elementary schooling in language and literature, there is a great deal in the Authorized Version which is simply incomprehensible. . . . There is the further danger that even where the language of the Bible is intelligible, the archaic flavour may well give the impression that the message of the Bible itself belongs to a bygone age, and has no relevance to the world of the twentieth century.

The point raised in the second sentence deserves to be pondered very seriously. Despite all the paganism of our day, there is also in many quarters a growing consciousness, vague it may be, that the Bible has something of fundamental importance to say to our generation; and many for whom it is at present a closed book would be ready to read it and to study it if only it was presented to them as a 'contemporary' volume, written in a language which they could understand and appreciate.

This may be true; but it brings us face to face with the problems, complicated and in many cases insuperable, that are involved in a modern translation of the Bible. Can the translator, working within the limitations of his craft, accomplish by himself all that is here hoped for? He is not an expositor. Yet he has to deal with conditions of life, or with technical terms, that are strange to the English reader. To take a simple example, how is he to deal with the 'girt

loins' of Luke 12₃₅, and Ephesians 6₁₄? Or with the 'ten thousand talents' and the 'hundred pence' of Matthew 18_{24, 28}? How is he, in one succinct phrase, to strike the true note about 'the righteousness of God' in such key-passages as Romans 1₁₇, 3₂₂? The translator must clearly have a certain amount of freedom if he is to produce something which will carry his readers along; but how far is that freedom to be allowed to go? By introducing here and there an explanatory comment, or by a copious resort to paraphrase, he may succeed in making the reading of a Pauline epistle not merely intelligible, but even interesting and arresting; and readers who are not familiar with the Greek will not be conscious of these deviations from the original. But in an official translation like the N.E.B. it is desirable to set bounds to this freedom. Its aim is to be both accurate in its rendering of the Greek, and idiomatic in its use of English.

Among other reasons for the issue of the New English Bible we must not forget the great advances made since 1611 in our knowledge of the Greek Text of the New Testament. Some account of the subsequent progress in textual criticism was taken in the Revised Version of the New Testament, which appeared in 1881. But (as is explained in the introduction to the library edition of the N.E.B.) several new sources of evidence have appeared since then, including some papyrus fragments of a very early date; and the theory of textual developments propounded by Westcott and Hort in 1881 is now seen to call for considerable modification. Several new printed editions of the Greek New Testament have appeared in comparatively recent years; but at the time when work was begun on the N.E.B. it was agreed that no one of these had, in the present state of textual opinion, acquired sufficient authority to justify its exclusive use as a basis for the new translation. Accordingly, in cases of importance where there was serious doubt as to the correct text, the translators have weighed the evidence and exercised their own judgement. Sometimes they have found it hard to make a decision; sometimes there has been a difference of opinion; and where the matter seemed one of importance they have followed one reading in the text, another in the margin. A notable example of this is in St Luke's account of the Last Supper (22₁₉). They have not felt it necessary (as Moffatt did) to allow for transpositions in the Fourth Gospel. But they have omitted the *pericope adulterae* in John 7_{53ff}, adding a translation of it elsewhere.

Now that this new translation has appeared, it remains to be seen what reception it will have, and what use will be made of it. It will no doubt receive criticism, like every other new Bible translation; and helpful criticism will be welcomed. It will, we may hope, have a wide circulation among private readers, and find its way into many houses. Will it perhaps come to be widely adopted for use in schools? Above all, what use will the Churches make of it? One can imagine use being made of it in Bible classes, youth fellowships, and other gatherings where emphasis is laid primarily on instruction. And what about its place in public worship? It is not designed to replace the Authorized Version (at least in our day), but rather to supplement it; and as people become more familiar with it we may expect that there will be an increasing readiness to have it read at Church services, and that Church authorities will commend its use. We may recall that even the A.V. only slowly, and after much fierce criticism, found its way to general favour. There is indeed no clear evidence of its receiving official 'authorization'; did it become 'authorized' simply because it deserved to be?

The New English Bible is not to be thought of merely as a new 'translation'; it is as truly 'the Bible' as the 1611 version is. What is claimed for it is that it is an attempt, prompted and sponsored by the Churches of our land, to relate the Bible to the needs of our own day. If it is criticized for sacrificing the hallowed associations of the Bible as we used to know it, our answer must be that it is designed to meet a new situation. And this brings us back to the fact that it was on the initiative of the Churches that the work was undertaken. There is surely a deep significance in that. The New English Bible represents a co-operative effort on the part of the British Churches; in that respect it accords with the ecumenical spirit of our age. It represents, too, the missionary-mindedness of the Churches; they are reaching out beyond their own members, and seeking to make the Bible live for those to whom it is at present moribund, or dead. And our prayer is that through it, as through its great predecessor of three and a half centuries ago, men may again hear the voice of God speaking to them in words which they can understand, summoning them to learn of His ways and to walk in His paths, and moving them to say: 'This is our God; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.'

RELIGIOUS VALUES OF THE NEW VERSION

Kenneth Grayston

THIS NEW translation raises, first, the question of truth. Is it, or is it not, a better guide to what the biblical writers said than other versions?

There can be no doubt that the Greek text from which it was made is far better than the text used by the translators of the Authorized Version. Anyone who takes the trouble to compare the Authorized Version with the Revised (whose makers well knew the inadequacy of the older version's text) will discover a large number of differences, great and small. For example, in 1 John 4¹⁹ the Authorized Version reads, 'We love him, because he first loved us'; but the Revised Version has 'We love, because he first loved us'. Both statements are true; but the second is far wider in meaning. As Professor C. H. Dodd says in his comment on the verse, 'our very capacity to love, whether the object of our love be God or our neighbour, is given to us in the fact of our being loved by God' (*The Johannine Epistles*, p.123). The reading of the Revised Version is a translation of the Greek of Codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. After 'we love', Codex Sinaiticus and the Latin Version add 'God'; and Greek manuscripts of the ninth century and later add 'him'. Textual critics are commonly agreed that the shorter reading is original, and that the additions were made by scribes who noted the obvious and failed to perceive the wider

meaning. Therefore most modern translators have followed the Revised Version. One exception is R. A. Knox, who translates from the Vulgate; another is J. B. Phillips, who claims (but in this instance wrongly) to translate the Greek text used in the 1881 revision.

The Revised Version relied rather too much on the excellence of Codex Vaticanus and its allies. In the last eighty years much new textual evidence has become available, but textual scholarship is not yet in a position to produce a definitive Greek text. Each variant reading must be decided on its merits, and there is room for difference of judgement. Thus although the Greek text behind the New English Bible is better than texts used for the Authorized and Revised Versions, it is not always certain. From time to time the margin records possible variants which are of some importance. There are about twenty-seven in Matthew and twelve in Romans.

The margin also records a number of alternative translations—about twenty-six in Matthew and twenty-nine in Romans. Our knowledge of the Koine Greek, such as was used by the New Testament writers, permits a more flexible translation than was possible for the Authorized Version translators and the revisers. Even so, the meaning of some words is still not certain. The most famous example is *epiousios* in the Lord's Prayer, which is commonly, and probably correctly, translated 'daily', but may possibly mean 'for the coming day', as in the margin of the Revised Version. Not infrequently it is possible to take words and constructions in different ways, sometimes with a considerable shift of meaning. Thus in Matthew 16₁₈, the Revised Version translated rather literally and reads, 'The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it'. But does this mean that the forces of death shall never overpower it, or that the gates of death shall never close upon it?

By studying the margin of the new translation, the reader will perceive that the question of truth is not to be answered easily. There can be no doubt that this version is a more reliable guide than the Authorized Version to the original meaning of the New Testament; but there is still a margin of uncertainty. The same conclusion is reached if thought is given to the question of intelligibility.

The language of the Authorized Version is honoured and, in an odd way, cherished by long usage. But the Authorized Version is like the branch railway line which nobody bothers to use until it is to be abandoned. If people really read the Authorized Version they would see how unintelligible it often is; and if they thought that they understood its meaning they would probably be wrong. What, for example, can be made of Romans 5₁₅: 'But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many'? The Authorized Version has been greatly overpraised, as the late Mgr Knox once and for all made plain in his entertaining and instructive book, *On Englishing the Bible*.

Nor, in the respect, is the Revised Version much better. Indeed, its principles of translation make it rather more inflexible than the Authorized Version. Its language is literal and stilted. Painstakingly it follows the Greek idiom as closely as can be done in tolerable English. It is a good crib for the student who has little Greek and wants a lifeline; but too often it turns meaningful Greek

into barely intelligible English. Again and again one thinks, 'Yes, that is what it *says*; but what does it *mean*?' When people have made do with this kind of translation long enough, they naturally assume that the New Testament documents were written in such awkward language and that the Christian religion itself is stiff and alien. That is bad. A translation which keeps close to the original in reproducing as far as possible its word order, idiom, and rhythm is useful and even essential when ancient texts are first published for study. The Coptic Gospel of Thomas is properly translated in this manner for students who know no Coptic, but need to study these reputed sayings of Jesus. But it may be seriously doubted whether writings which are intended to play an important part in the life and worship of Christians should be so translated.

The Revised Standard Version has shown that such a view of translation need not produce pedantic and stilted English. The well-deserved success of this American version must be due, not only to the skill of its translators, but also to the sense of relief among those who read it on discovering that the old phrases apparently mean something intelligible. Yet even the Revised Standard Version is written in a 'dignified English' which nobody would speak or perhaps has ever spoken. Would Peter really say, 'Lord, it is well that we are here'? And would Jesus reply, 'Rise, and have no fear'? Would they not say, 'How good it is to be here' and 'stand up; do not be afraid'? (Mt 17_{4,7}) The New English Bible has therefore abandoned one principle of translation for another. The translators have first bent their minds to understand what the writer meant, and then have asked themselves how this meaning can be presented in modern English word order, idiom, and rhythm. It will be found, therefore, that the new version reads more flowingly than other versions. Words and phrases of the Greek are interpreted by terms which represent, so far as is possible, the corresponding way of thinking in our own age. Many people will have noticed in the Revised Version the unfortunate typographical device of printing in italics words demanded by the English, but not actually present in the Greek. There are no such italics in the new version. It is not a word-for-word translation, but an attempt to transfer the thought of one language into the thought forms of another.

This inevitably means that there is much interpretation. Of course, every translation, more or less, is interpretation. Anyone who has attempted the task with minute care realizes that translation is not really possible at all. Time and again he must decide for *this* interpretation and against *that*; and even so he will often know that a spread of meaning in the original has been ignored in the version. How is it possible to represent by a single word what the Hebrews meant by *torah* and the Greeks by *nomos*? The word 'law' will scarcely do, but we must use it for want of a better. How shall he convey what St Paul meant by his varied and distinctive use of *sarx*? Frequently it means 'the self-centred human nature'; it will never do to remain satisfied with the translation 'flesh'. This ultimate impossibility of translation justifies a minister, and as many others as can, spending time and painful energy in mastering the biblical languages. What cannot be translated can often be successfully expounded in a sermon and prayed about in a meditation.

Where there is interpretation there will always be disagreement. Readers of the New English Bible who have themselves given careful study to the Greek

will sometimes find themselves disagreeing with the translators. So here again is a margin of uncertainty.

The attempt to provide a true and intelligible translation leads us therefore to a fundamental religious question about the authority of Scripture. The New English Bible has been planned and directed by representatives of the main Churches of Great Britain, except the Roman Catholic. It cannot be supposed that they are saying that this, and this only, is the authoritative interpretation of the Bible. If some of these Churches authorize the New English Bible for use in public worship it will presumably mean that this interpretation is acceptable to their traditions of faith and learning. At the same time this corporate act of scholarship may be regarded as a timely warning against inaccuracy and uncontrolled interpretation in private versions of the Bible. It should also perhaps make speakers a little cautious in asserting too simply that 'the Bible says' this or that. If we reflect on the fact that the New English Bible is very different from the Authorized Version, we may be tempted to think that one must be false and the other true. This is the kind of situation in which many Christians easily give way to dismay and confess that they do not know where they are. The New English Bible will seem to have undermined an old, comfortable security, and may leave them uncertain and resentful. They will find an answer to their problem in the familiar statement that the Bible is a living book.

This must be understood in two ways. First, the interpretation of the Bible changes from age to age because the circumstances of the readers change. In our own day, for example, we are disposed, because of our experiences, to take more seriously than Christians living in a settled period the eschatological teaching of Jesus. At the same time we do not necessarily interpret and apply it in a purely literal manner, because our understanding has been opened to the truth and validity of non-literal symbols. The Bible may be described as a living book because it has this power to provoke various responses, none of them untrue to its central affirmations, from age to age. Secondly, it must be admitted—though it sounds somewhat arrogant—that we know more than our forefathers. We may not be better men than they, but we certainly have more knowledge than they about the biblical languages, the biblical history and environment, about the world in which we live and the nature of mankind. This may sometimes be a dangerous and unwelcome burden, but we have it; and an adequate doctrine of creation and providence will hold that God intends us to have it. When, possessing this knowledge (or possessed by it), we read the Bible, our interpretation cannot always be what our forefathers said. In our own way, we too may say that 'the Lord hath yet more light and truth to break forth from His Holy Word'. It is Jesus Christ who is the same yesterday, today, and for ever; not the writings which testify to Him.

If the New English Bible succeeds in being intelligible, it is only to be expected that some Christians will resent it. Incomprehensible expressions in Holy Writ, when they are familiar enough, can become without conscious effort a kind of hieratic language. They have a soothing and comforting effect, like the blessed word 'Basingstoke' in *Ruddigore*. When they are transplanted their bare meaning is exposed and the incantation is gone. The famous words 'worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness' (1 Ch 16₂₉; Ps 29₂, 96₉) are apparently

a mistranslation. The Revised Standard Version, agreeing with the margin of the Revised Version, reads, 'Worship the Lord in holy array' (meaning 'wearing your holy vestments'). The *Broadcast Psalter*, which commanded the services of a distinguished Hebraist as reviser, translated 'Worship the Lord with holy worship' in Psalm 29, but lacked the courage of its convictions in Psalm 96. The familiar mistranslation gains its attractiveness precisely because the two abstract words, 'beauty' and 'holiness', form a phrase of indefinite religious meaning. The inept verses to which they gave rise at the hands of John Samuel Bewley Monsell do nothing to make their meaning plain or, as good poetry would, to give forceful expression to their imaginative range. 'Beauty of Holiness' is an incantation beside which the correct translation sounds a little prosaic.

This illustration in itself is trivial, but it points to an important problem. What will become of the liturgical language of the Church—that is, the language, often highly pictorial, in which men have been accustomed to phrase their prayers and the testimonies of their faith? Consider the word 'blood' with its powerful associations in the Bible, the Prayer Book, and the hymnal. In Romans 3₂₅ the Authorized Version has, 'a propitiation through faith in his blood'. The Revised Standard Version is certainly better with 'an expiation by his blood, to be received by faith'. In Romans 5, the Authorized Version has, 'being now justified by his blood'. In both places it would express the meaning and give content to the word 'blood' if it were replaced by 'sacrificial death'; and no doubt this is what ought to be done. But in so doing many links are snapped, and it will not be obvious to all that St Paul's treatment of justification has some connexion with our Lord's words: 'This is my blood of the covenant.'

It must be remembered that the New English Bible is not intended, in the first place, for reading in Church. Nor is it directed primarily to those for whom the language of the Authorized Version and the Prayer Book is the familiar and natural language of devotion. But it is inevitable that the question should be asked whether the New English Bible should bear on its title-page the words 'Appointed to be read in Churches' (though the Authorized Version has never been officially authorized). Can a translation in contemporary English appropriately be used alongside forms of worship which make use of archaic English? Do our forms of worship need modernizing, and how would that be done? What is the function of the biblical readings in worship? These are questions which different Churches will answer in their own way; but it is not too much to suggest that the publication of the New English Bible, under the official direction of the Churches, demands from us a reconsideration of Christian worship and its relation to the Bible.

One last question must be noted—perhaps the most important of all. Is the Bible a book belonging solely to the Church, or is it also God's means for speaking to His children outside the Church? It is very easy to suppose that the tests to be applied to the New English Bible are those which suggest themselves to Church members; but the Bible has shown itself again and again to be an effective means of propaganda. The translators of the new version have constantly kept in mind the large section of the population (including many children in the schools of our country) who have no effective contact with the

Church in any of its communions. Such people, they believe, can understand quite a lot of the Bible if it is put before them in language which they can accept. It is indeed true that the Christian message is not made agreeable to modern people simply by being translated into modern English. Indeed, it may sometimes become less agreeable. It is also true that some biblical words and ideas cannot be put into modern terms, and by this very fact we are led to question some common assumptions of our own day. Let all this be granted; it may yet be argued that we have a duty to make the Bible as plain and contemporary as we can. Only so can non-believing friends be confronted with the real 'offence of the Gospel'.

THE ENGLISH OF THE NEW TRANSLATION

The Bishop of Winchester

THE ART of translation is a subject which has occupied and perplexed many minds. All who have seriously considered it know the difficulties and there would probably be general agreement that translators of the Bible are faced by the most formidable task of all. The reasons for this are obvious enough, and I need not restate them here in any formal way. But it is well to remember that translation of the Bible into modern *English* has particular hazards of its own; some of them, no doubt, belong to the rapid changes of our language, but the greatest of all is due to the magnificence of our Authorized Version. It is open to plenty of criticism, and has received it in its own century and since. But it is not easy to escape from the sway of its rhythm and from the frequent glory of its words. And the Authorized Version is often at its very best in the most familiar passages, where any change will seem to many almost a sacrilege. This has set a formidable problem to revisers of the Authorized Version—that is, to those who have been concerned to keep as close as possible to its text, while correcting mistakes or removing words which have become obsolete or open to misunderstanding. The problem has here and there been satisfactorily solved, but its difficulty is plainly seen in the Revised Version, and, though many people have continued to believe that revision of the Authorized Version rather than a completely new translation is the right course, it has become increasingly hard to accept that belief. As everyone knows, this century has been prolific of definitely new translation, whether of the whole Bible or

parts of it, and it is with the latest attempt of this kind that this article is concerned.

It will be well to set out in some detail the principles laid down for the translators, and observed by them to the best of their power. Unless these principles are remembered, no one can pass a fair judgement on the work that has been done; whether the ultimate verdict of the reader be favourable or otherwise, he must be asked to remember the instructions which have governed the enterprise. It is no doubt well known to many that it owes its origin to the initiative of the Church of Scotland and that it follows lines suggested by that Church and accepted by a widely representative body drawn from other Churches in these islands. The decision was clear and emphatic that the original text should be translated into contemporary or 'current' English: archaisms were to be avoided, and the usages of modern English idiom observed. The work was not to be a revision of any previous translation; its purpose must be to present the meaning of the original as closely as possible in the English of our day. The translators were thus left in no doubt about the nature of their commission, and they have tried to remember it throughout.

Any considering person who is tolerably familiar with the Bible, and who also has in mind the general character of the English language as it now is, will understand that, however clear and acceptable the conditions laid down may be, it has often been hard to carry them out consistently. Current English usage is not a fixed or always easily ascertainable quantity! Words which are well enough understood by people who are in middle life, or beyond it, have become strange and sometimes unintelligible to the young. And though we have well understood that our language will continue to change, and that no translation can be 'final', we have yet been naturally anxious that our work should not be too obviously 'dated'. There is talk sometimes of 'timeless' English. If anyone cares to say that there is no such thing, it is perhaps hard to quarrel with him. Yet we may believe that there is a fairly large element of permanence in our vocabulary and syntax, and that in translation—above all, in translation of the Bible—it is right to look for and to use that element. But even some very familiar words have suffered considerable change of meaning and may mislead the reader, while, on the other hand, the translator is faced by the formidable problem of colloquialisms: they are often vivid and tempting, but will they last and are they tolerable? For example, 'a den of thieves' is not current English: 'a gangsters' hide-out' represents the meaning of the original vividly, but would that phrase be either tolerable or lasting? We thought not, and have rendered the original by 'a robber's cave'. This kind of choice, often a really perplexing one, has continually presented itself. I think members of the panels would agree that repeatedly, and sometimes in passages which at first seemed simple enough, we have had to stop and ask ourselves, at some length, hard questions about modern idiom!

Recent translators of the Bible, or of parts of it, have rightly felt obliged to remember that good contemporary writing favours the short sentence and a certain directness and simplicity of speech. We shall be disappointed if it is not found that in many of the more difficult passages of the New Testament—for example, in complicated Pauline expositions and arguments—the meaning is now more clearly brought out. We have broken up long periods,

and tried to convey the full meaning with all the brevity that we could contrive. This is perhaps the place where I can best say a little about the relations of translation and paraphrase, though I am far indeed from supposing that I can add anything essential to the wise words of the Introduction which precedes our translation. But the matter is so important that it can bear emphasis. We have done our utmost to keep as close to the text as possible. There is no doubt about the value of paraphrase: it has a function to perform which the closer translation must to some extent forgo, and which we have consciously forgone. Over and over again we have been tempted to become commentators. The temptation has come in various forms: we might have increased the length and scope of the footnotes; we might have included a glossary: this latter project was indeed for long entertained, and it would have served some good purposes: it would perhaps have provided an answer to some doubts and criticisms. But in the end, and I think rightly, we were convinced that the notes should be kept to a minimum, dealing with variations of text, and that a glossary, if it were to be of any real value, would involve us in a degree of comment, often on disputed points, which lay outside our task of translation. A few headings have been provided, but, apart from these and the very brief textual notes, we provide a 'plain text'. This means, of course, that we have made our decisions about renderings without giving defence or explanation of them. We believed *translation* to be our business and have confined ourselves almost exclusively to that.

There is another point which readers may be invited to consider. The New Testament contains writings of many differing kinds and styles. These variations are largely concealed from the reader of the English versions most familiar to us. But they certainly exist, and we hope that our translation makes them apparent. It silently incorporates a great deal that has been taught us by scholars of recent generations and of our own, and it may be hoped that it will help those who are unfamiliar with the original Greek to understand better the special characteristics and interests of the writers as they dealt with their great common concern.

It would be easy—and it is tempting!—to write further about other considerations which will, we hope, be in the minds of those who may read our translation whether privately or publicly. We trust that it will be read with sympathy; it will rightly be a critical sympathy, and, we can ask for nothing better than that, for it means a fair judgement. And before I end this article I may be allowed to add some comments and illustrations which can perhaps assist such a judgement by reference to some familiar passages—passages which are among those most commonly known and most frequently heard in public worship. Before turning to this concluding part of what I have to say, I would emphasize that in the course of our work we have consistently read our renderings aloud, and learned much by doing so; that we have been careful not to have other modern translations before us (though I am sure it will often be found that there is much agreement); and that we have frequently remarked that the Authorized Version is often at its wonderful best in the places that we best know—so we have been left in no doubt of the standard by which we shall often be tested.

This part of my article is being written just after Christmas, and I cannot

do better than refer first to some passages closely linked with that season. Let the reader turn to the first chapter of the Gospel according to John, verses 1-14. It may be hoped that he will agree that the passage retains the majesty of the Authorized Version, while the meaning is in some places more clearly defined. Nothing is more difficult than to read such verses as these as if one had never read them before. But it is worth while, I am sure, to make the effort, and then to recall the familiar Authorized Version text and consider the two together. The claim may, I think, fairly be made that the new text throws fresh light upon the old, and also that it can stand in its own right. Or again, consider Hebrews 1₁₋₁₃, where a careful reading may lead to the same conclusion. Or the Magnificat (Lk 1₄₆₋₅₅). These verses illustrate as well as any the kind of way in which, when we were dealing with a great passage of poetry, we tried to obey our commission to translate, as men of the twentieth century, words so magnificently rendered by our forefathers. Let the reader judge the result: does the magnificence remain and impress itself on mind and heart? Has the language of our own day shown itself to possess a force and a colour of its own able to do justice to a great original?

Or turn to a few of the parables. In that of the Prodigal Son (Lk 15₁₁₋₃₂), where the Authorized Version reaches one of its greatest heights, the new translation has a life and directness of its own (notice in verse 20, 'his heart went out to him') and, after many readings, I cannot feel that 'current English' has failed to bring out and sometimes even to sharpen the vivid beauty of the tale. There follows (Lk 16₁₋₈), the story of the 'Unjust Steward' (in our translation, the 'Dishonest Bailiff'). I think it may be agreed that the last verse of this in our translation ('For the worldly are more astute than the other-worldly in dealing with their own kind') is a good example of clarification, and that verses 3 and 4 ('I am not strong enough to dig and too proud to beg. I know what I must do, to make sure that, when I have to leave there will be people to give me house and home'), with their strong succession of monosyllables and a certain bare directness of language, reveal the man and his predicament with a sharp energy of phrase. Those examples have been taken almost at random: Matthew 21₂₈₋₄₃ might equally well be quoted. And I think that throughout the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles—not least in the story of St Paul's shipwreck—readers will find much fresh and vigorous narrative.

I suppose that on the whole the best service of modern translations has been done in the elucidation of the Epistles (called 'Letters' in our translation), and particularly those of St Paul. Here the Authorized Version is often obscure and tortuous and, as everyone at all familiar with the subject knows, it is here that modern scholarship has drawn particular advantage from ever-increasing knowledge of the Greek of the New Testament. The readers of our translation will, I believe, find many rough places plainer, though they will still rightly require careful study: Paul can be at times very hard to interpret! It is not easy to suggest particular passages for a first consideration, but it may be a good, because a severe test to mention a few that are either especially well known or, for one reason or another, face the translator with a task uncommonly hard. Everyone will look at 1 Corinthians 13, and find some stimulus there to fresh reflection on its meaning. In 2 Corinthians 2₇₋₁₈, a great passage of some complication is made we hope more plainly comprehensible: 6₃₋₁₀

of the same letter seems to me to exemplify a good many of the marks of our work; it may be, that the last clause 'penniless, we own the world', may be startling at first reading, but it is sound, 'current English', and it is a live and telling phrase. A famous theological exposition (Col 1¹³⁻²⁰) is full of meaning, conveyed we hope with faithfulness and force: Hebrews 11^{32-end} keeps, we trust, its fiery eloquence: 1 John 3¹⁸⁻²⁴, so much debated, invites the commentator's help, but provides him with a long-considered text for his commentary. We faced the Revelation of John with some apprehension, as all translators must. As I read afresh what we have made of it, I do not find its splendours marred, while many details of meaning are set in a clearer light.

Now I must bring this brief review to an end. But before I do so I ask close and critical readers (and may there be many such just judges!) to believe that we have done our utmost to consult the best sources both in our selection of 'current English' and in our decisions on the right rendering of contested or 'technical' words and phrases. These readers will quickly discover that we have expelled the word 'and' in a multitude of places. We have tried to keep clear not only of archaism, but also of circumlocution and participial constructions. We have aimed at a concise directness, with due regard to the diversities of our original. It has naturally not been easy to write this article with complete impartiality, but I beg any reader of it to remember throughout that, though I have often written in the first person, I have not been commenting on work of my own! The work is the result of the free and full and prolonged labours of many minds. During its progress I have sometimes thought that it would be interesting and instructive to make a brief collection of some of the denunciations with which new translations of the Scriptures have not seldom been greeted. Many wise and delightful comments are made upon them in that great piece of English prose, 'The Translators to the Reader' which prefaces the Authorized Version, though alas! it is commonly omitted from most modern editions. 'Was there ever any thing projected, that savoured any way of newness or renewing, but the same endured many a storm of gainsaying or opposition?' writes its author. I will only say, with the writer of our Introduction, that 'the translators are as conscious as anyone can be of the limitations and imperfections of their work', yet that we 'trust that under the providence of Almighty God this translation may open the truth of the scriptures to many who have been hindered in their approach to it by barriers of language.'

CHARLES GORE

W. F. Lofthouse

ABOUT THIRTY years after his death, a judicious and critical book on Bishop Gore has appeared. The author, Mr James Carpenter, gives it the sub-title, 'A Study of Liberal Catholic Thought' (Gore, Faith Press, 30s.). There is certainly a place for it, for Gore was the most conspicuous Churchman of his generation, as William Temple was of the generation following. 'Liberal Catholic' was the term which Gore applied to himself. 'I can conceive of no higher or more sacred vocation', he said in 1917, 'than that of ministering to the maintenance of the Liberal Catholic tradition for generations yet to come'. But in spite of his emphasis, the title was hardly a happy one. Both terms are far too ambiguous. 'Liberal' suggests to the politician or the historian, Gladstone, Asquith, Morley; and to the churchman Maude, Westcott, Schleiermacher, or Bultmann. Catholic means Keble and Pusey, or Manning and Newman. And is it even possible for a Liberal to be a Catholic? Loisy hoped it might be, but no Roman pontiff would allow it. It is safer as well as more modest to say that the Catholic is the reverse of the Protestant; he does not believe in the encounter of the individual with Christ; and that the Liberal acts and thinks as if he were against, or *en route* for, social authority (the 'or' shows the strength and the weakness of the party in politics and religion).

We shall therefore be better advised, neglecting the author's title, to follow his guidance in the study of Gore's intellectual and ecclesiastical life. He intends no set biography; there is no account of Gore's inner religious life or of his friendships—of all that made him the best-loved, as well as one of the best-hated men, of his time. The successive chapters deal with the various aspects of his writing; but they are preceded by a biographical sketch, which many readers will perhaps find the most interesting part of the book. His life lasted from 1853 to 1932, just under eighty years. Born in the atmosphere of aristocratic Whiggery, as Mr Carpenter calls it, he went up to Oxford with a Balliol scholarship in 1870, the year which saw the University opened to men of all creeds and which preceded that in which the first of the great Education Acts was passed. He was a Christian, as he said, from early youth, with an inborn fondness for incense and ceremony, and with a love for the poor which he learnt from Westcott, one of the younger masters at his school at Harrow. From the very first, the place of the Church in society, the meaning of the social movement, the growing claims of 'criticism', the positive and prophetic teaching by which alone the world could be overcome, and the hopes and dangers that crowded around the dreams of Church union, clustered into the arena of his mind, though any one of them might have been enough to occupy a man's life and thought.

Elected a Fellow of Trinity in 1875, he soon became the centre of a group of young Churchmen—Paget, R. C. Moberly, Illingworth, and others—who produced, in 1895, *Lux Mundi*, a sort of reply, brought up to date, to *Essays*

and *Reviews*. In 1883 he became the Principal of Pusey House, the home of the aggressive High Churchmen of the time; in 1889 he directed for five years the Community of the Resurrection and the Oxford Branch of the Christian Social Union; in 1891 his literary career was really begun with the Bampton Lectures on *The Incarnation of the Son of God*; and in 1894 he became a Canon of Westminster.

Then came his three bishoprics—at Worcester (1901), where he had to deal with a compact mass of traditions; at Birmingham (1905), where he had to start 'from scratch', so to speak, in a new diocese carved out of his old one; and at Oxford (1911), where the study and research to which he had looked forward were sadly delayed by the sluggishness, or the caution, of that ancient body. After the care of that see was laid down, with relief, in 1919, some thirteen years of life were left to him, crowned by the Gifford Lectures on *The Philosophy of the Good Life*, delivered at St Andrews in 1929–30—and a visit to India which proved too much for his failing strength; he came home to die.

The varied activities of his unrelenting life may best be remembered if it is divided into three parts, at Oxford and Westminster, the 'glad confident morning'; the three bishoprics, when, to quote the old Greek proverb, 'responsibility revealed the man'; and his active retirement, when to the end 'something of prophetic strain' shone forth in his refusal to fail or be discouraged. Mr Carpenter's plan is not chronological, but logical. Strictly speaking, Gore was not a progressive thinker, and he avoided the charge that he repeated himself by constantly applying his principles to fresh situations and contentions. A list of the author's chapters makes this clear enough. Here it is: Ch. 2, *Catholicism and Liberal Catholicism*; Canon, Creed and Episcopacy are the main characteristics of the latter. Ch. 3, *Philosophy and Prophecy*; on the influence of Butler and T. H. Green, and the impact of the 'new theology'. Ch. 4, *History and Christianity*; on the relation of the Old Testament to the New, and the place of Miracles. Ch. 5, *Authority and the Function of the Church*. Chs. 6 and 7, *The Incarnation of the Word of God, and the Incarnation and Redemption*; it is around the Incarnation that all the doctrines of the Church describe their circles, but they can only be understood by a genuine exposition of the Kenotic doctrine. Ch. 8, *Redemption and the Church*; the three Sacraments and the Ministry. Ch. 9, *The Mission of the Church in Society*; notably in Theology and Ethics, in Property, and in Disestablishment.

The reader may well exclaim that if Gore never set himself down to write one great theological work, he was always using everything he wrote, like John Wesley, to express his own theology. This can best be seen if we refer to the several chapters, availing ourselves, where possible, of the author's own words. By Catholicism, said Gore, I mean the establishment of a visible society as the divinely appointed home of salvation held together not only by the inward spirit but also by certain manifest and external institutions. Yet Christ, 'the word in every man's heart,' 'has left himself nowhere in any religion without witness'. 'Reason is unity with God.' But to Gore this means just Anglicanism. Not that he refuses the name of religion to other bodies, but properly speaking, although they may be Christian they are not liberal. Still, he proclaimed himself a 'free thinker': 'I could not but follow the light of reason wherever it should lead me', like Erigena, Hegel and Butler. But the prophets and Plato had taught

him the immediacy of God's presence in the human mind. On this there could be no argument; reason is rooted and grounded in faith. Is this dualism? he asks. If so, is it not the demand of common sense?

When Gore reached Oxford, the credibility of the Old Testament had seemed to many to be the central battle-field of the Christian faith. It was characteristic that in *Lux Mundi* he chose this topic. But he had, at least to our eyes, no great difficulty. He could adapt himself to questions of authorship, pictorial writing, and symbolism. But the New Testament was a different matter; the statements there must be taken as literal truth, more particularly the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. It was these which gave the Old Testament narratives their importance. For the denial of the miraculous he had no mercy. Mr Carpenter, quoting A. E. Taylor, roundly questions this conclusion. Again, neither the author nor Gore himself appears to have noted the importance of the years of tradition between an event's taking place and its being written down once or several times, or the fact that an event which tradition calls miraculous may now be considered an every-day occurrence. And surely it is not irreverent to ask what went on in the Virgin's womb, or when the Saviour actually left the broken sepulchre. But this is not the last word of Gore. Behind all this stands not merely the Protestant biblicism, but the authority of the Church, 'intelligent co-operation with the divine purpose'. Faith is contrasted, in the Bible, not with reason but with sight; and the Church has gone on century after century developing not dogma but theology. The authority of the Church rests on its coherence and its rationality. The 'Church' here seems to mean the Fathers of the undivided Church and the thirty-nine articles, between which there is no inconsistency—many voices, yet one voice. Further, the Church is not a sort of crowd or gang of Christ's followers. Christ, as the Son of God, is the Head of the Church; and the Church, though not an 'extension of the Incarnation', is 'infused with the Spirit of Christ'.

What, then, of the silences, or the actual errors, attributed to Him? Here Gore will be satisfied by no simple device of finding error in the narrators. He falls back on the Kenotic doctrine, which, indeed, says Mr Carpenter, is 'the most vigorous expression of his attempt to construct a liberal Catholicism'. 'Our Lord lived and taught, He thought and was inspired and tempted as true and proper man, under the limitations of consciousness which alone made possible a real human life.' The act of Incarnation is 'self-beggary'. And in this doctrine, adds Dr Kirk, Gore was the first of English theologians to give the Gospels their due. He has been widely criticized; but have the critics, asks Mr Carpenter, done any better? He himself felt all the legitimate claims of historical criticism; but this only led him on to the Atonement. The whole state of the Church is made to depend on the sacrifice of the Cross; but that sacrifice was vicarious, not substitutionary, 'and by it I am lifted from the state of the old Adam to that of the new'. 'To be absolved is not to be let off'.

There are three Sacraments—'Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist'. Baptism implies a definite *opus operatum*; but it is useless without conduct. Little is said of confirmation. 'The Eucharist marks the highest point of Christian worship.' Yet after Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine, there is a steady decline in the doctrine of the Eucharist. 'No Soul of transubstantiation can be loyal to the Prayer Book.' 'The Sacrifice belongs not to the individual, but to the Church

as a whole.' In view of the New Testament, non-episcopal Ministries must be set down as 'precarious'. But the Ministry needs to be purged, and vindicated. It is 'by a common instinct that we pass from the apostolate to the three-fold ministry.'

Lastly, Gore speaks of the Mission of the Church in Society, rather than of social service or of social justice. 'Liberty, equality and fraternity are of divine origin'; but it is only through the word made flesh and its existence in Church and Sacraments that the life of the individual and of society is interpreted by the logos.' In 1906, he said, he had been possessed by a permanently troubled social conscience; he applied, but in vain, to the Pan-Anglican Congress to identify the Church with socialism. He did not expect a perfect society, but a new and Christian ('liberal Catholic') attitude. 'The only Christian view of property is to aim at teaching the best possible life for all and each' through the efforts of small bodies of consecrated men. He gradually came to see that he could not join others in opposing disestablishment. The author quotes Dr Major as saying that after Gore, 'the Church is no longer the conservative party at prayer, but, in the presence of the Anglo-Catholic clergy, the socialistic party at Mass'.

The bibliography is so extensive that no part of the preparation of the book demanded more labour. The full list of Gore's works runs to fifteen pages; books about Gore run to another fourteen. To work through the footnotes would more than double the labour of mastering the book. It is only fair, too, to add that some of the most popular of Gore's books are not mentioned—as *The Jesus of Nazareth*, the Halley Stewart Lectures, and the lectures on Ephesians and Romans.

There are no illustrations, save the frontispiece, a drawing by Mansbridge, who founded the Workers' Educational Association as a result of some sermons by Gore, heard in Westminster Abbey in 1902. No date is given for the portrait, but it was evidently drawn late in Gore's life. It shows a man tired, regretful, disappointed, a prophet who has seen his hopes gradually withdrawn. Such a mood could not have been unknown to Gore, whose hopes for the Church were so clouded by the 'pan-protestantism' he often lamented at Lausanne, and by the failure of his demands for the role of the Anglican Church in society. Was he ever tempted to wish that his place was with the Free Churchmen who pressed behind him when his own fellow-Churchmen drew back? Our psychologists no longer fear such hidden inconsistencies as this. But the prophet would never break the broken reed, and he clung to his ideal of the integration of life between the duty of the Church and the prospect for society.

One last question: What is the message of this rigid but lovable Anglican to Free Churchmen today? The Church, he proclaimed, was the authority which he would have defended with his life. William Temple, like many others, has pointed out the ambiguity of the term. Bishops, Congresses, Articles? None has ever proved satisfactory. It is to Christ, as every Free Churchman knows, that the sinner or the wanderer must make his way. But when he finds it, he finds others at his side; and then it is that he knows the thrill of membership in the army with banners. There could be no true ministry, said Gore, without bishops. Ambiguity again! The bishops who turned a deaf ear to

Wilberforce, who sided with the Hanoverians and the Stuarts, the warrior-statesmen of the Middle Ages, or the shouting crowds, now orthodox and now heretical, who filled the councils? How often has history been forced to lament, or sometimes perhaps to rejoice, that the bishops were so often on the wrong side, or that the touch of a finger could finally decide which is the true minister?

But this is not the only answer. God is always revealing Himself, to Greek as to Jew; only when Christ is given does reason find itself. The great text in Micah (justice, mercy, humility) is only fulfilled (filled full) in Christ. Here is the truth beneath all the hurly-burly of Kenoticism: He 'emptied himself of all but love'. Yet even if Gore did not know these words, he was the prophet and the apostle of Him of whom they have been sung for 200 years.

THE THEOLOGY OF WORSHIP

An Address delivered at the Commemoration Service
at Handsworth College on 4th November 1960

A. Raymond George

THREE GREAT movements, it is now widely recognized, mark the theological thought of our time. The first may be called the revival of biblical theology; this is a title at once less controversial and more comprehensive than such terms as 'neo-orthodoxy'; theology in the last forty years has shown new life in many ways, but the most notable feature is that scholars have turned to the Bible itself with an interest not simply in the literary and critical and historical questions which it raises, but with a new sense of its unity and of the coherent message which it brings to us. To this study of the Bible Methodist scholars have notably contributed, usually showing an admirable desire not to jettison the gains secured by these earlier critical studies in the enthusiasm for the newer and more theological approach; and, while avoiding the newer styles of allegorical exegesis, they have made a solid theological contribution.

The second great movement of our time, the great new fact of our era, as it has been called, is the ecumenical movement; and this has had its own commemoration this year (1960). It started in the Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, and this year of jubilee shows a multiplicity of developments and a growth of ecumenical spirit which do something at any rate to fulfil the hopes of the great Methodist layman John R. Mott and the other pioneers of the ecumenical movement. Here too Methodism has made its contribution, through the contributions of its scholars to the conferences of the various ecumenical bodies, and in another sense through Methodist union itself, through its contribution to such Church unions as those of South India and Canada, and through the growth of the World Methodist movement.

The third great movement of our time is a new growth of interest in worship.

To this we have probably contributed less than to the other two movements, but our Methodist tradition has its own contribution to make, and the Conference at Liverpool recognized the importance of this subject by sending a report on worship for the consideration of the Methodist people.

Now these three movements have as a matter of history been in various ways linked with each other; and certainly it is to the advantage of each that it should keep in touch with the others; and thus, in taking worship as my theme for this address, I hope to pursue it in an ecumenical spirit and to take the Bible as my starting-point.

I

We start with the fundamental question: what is worship? We shall not begin by examining instances of worship in other religions and then asking what is the differentia of Christian worship. The doctrine of the atonement affords a parallel; it is possible to expound the sacrificial theory of the work of Christ by examining the meaning of sacrifice first in pagan religion generally, then in the Semitic tribes, then in the Old Testament, and, finally, to ask whether the death of Christ may fairly be regarded as a sacrifice when sacrifice is thus defined. The results of such a procedure vary, of course, according to what interpretation was applied to the mass of material examined, for, whether we realize it or not, it is impossible to examine any mass of material without some principle of interpretation. But, as McLeod Campbell said, the Cross shines in its own light, and itself affords the true principle of interpretation; other things should be understood in the light of the Cross, not the Cross in the light of them. Similarly, by the way, the fathers should be understood in the light of the Bible, not the Bible in the light of the fathers. To some extent, indeed, it is necessary to consider the background, because the words used in the New Testament did not spring from the heads of the writers, as Athena is said to have sprung fully armed from the head of Zeus. The words had been cradled in earlier writers, and those, as we have often been reminded, were Hebraic rather than Hellenic. Nevertheless, as the history of the word *agapē* reminds us, it is the New Testament itself that is decisive. A word is for our purposes not what it was before the New Testament writers used it, but what they made of it.

Let us then start with the lexical (one might almost say, statistical) method. The only word which in the English version of the New Testament is translated 'worship' more than six times is *προσκυνέω*, which is so translated fifty-eight times: *προσκυνέω* means, in origin, 'kiss towards', and probably refers to prostrating oneself and kissing the hem of someone's garment. In the Septuagint this is used over 140 times to translate *shachah*, and the number of instances where it is used to translate other Hebrew words (apart from the Book of Daniel) is negligible; and with this same exception this same word *shachah* is the only Hebrew word which is translated 'worship' more than four times; there are ninety-six instances of this. But why is it translated *προσκυνέω* over 140 times and 'worship' only ninety-six times? The reason is that it has the meaning 'bow down' or 'prostrate oneself' before a king or superior, so that it is often translated *προσκυνέω* where the English version has 'bow', not 'worship'.

We can learn also from the distribution of the words. Thus of the sixty

instances of *προσκυνέω* in the New Testament no fewer than twenty-four occur in Revelation, which reminds us of the importance of this book for the study of New Testament worship. Many of the other instances are passages in the Synoptic Gospels, where people showed outward signs of reverence to Jesus, and it is clear, especially when we think of the corresponding uses of *shachah*, that some of these were what might be called 'secular' salutations, such as we make when we raise the hat or salute or bow to one who is worthy of respect, as, for instance, His Worship the Mayor. It is, of course, significant that Jesus, who held no official human office, so often commanded respect of this kind, though in Mark 15₁₉ this reverence is offered in mockery.

Yet even this brief use of the lexical method shows its limitations, for Paul used the word only once, and it would be plainly wrong to infer that he was not interested in worship or lacked an attitude of reverence. We must obviously go on to consider related concepts. Yet we have already learnt something—namely, that our attitude to God ought to contain an element of that reverence which on earth we show by outward signs to other men. To use the same word for both 'religious' and 'secular' purposes is largely a linguistic necessity, but it also emphasizes the down-to-earth nature of our religion; and is an example of that way of analogy or way of eminence which is a normal part of our theological method.

When we ask what other concepts we had better examine, it is natural to think of those passages where actual gatherings for worship are described; and if we start with the Old Testament we shall find a somewhat elaborate system of worship involving the temple and the home, while in the Jewish practice of our Lord's day the synagogue had also a prominent place. Now, the Old Testament writers were clearly not agreed about the value of some parts of this system, but we may safely say that the word *θυσία*, usually translated 'sacrifice', is a very common word in the Septuagint. It is used chiefly to translate two Hebrew roots, connected with two different types of sacrifice or offering; and it is used, especially in the Pentateuch, in literal accounts of their performance; it is also used in a spiritualized sense, as in Psalm 51₁₇ (using the English numbering), 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit', and sometimes in an unfavourable sense, as in the famous verse, Hosea 6₆ (quoted by our Lord, Mt 9₁₃, 12₇), which I will venture to translate, 'I prefer mercy to sacrifice'. Now in the New Testament the word is far less common, but it occurs twenty-nine times, and there are also instances of its cognates. Many of the instances of *θυσία* are references to the Old Testament sacrifices, and they are unfavourable or at least imply that the system has been superseded; indeed, this is the main burden of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which explicitly says that Christ offered one sacrifice for sins for ever (10₁₂). This quotation will also serve to introduce what we may call the favourable and positive uses of the word in the New Testament. It is similarly used of the self-offering of Christ in Ephesians 5₂: 'Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God.' If our theme were the sacrificial theory of the Atonement, some other texts might be quoted which do not explicitly use the word *θυσία*. But we are concerned rather with texts which use the word 'sacrifice' to describe things which *we* do, other than the Old Testament sacrifices. In 1 Peter 2₆ there is a reference to Christians offering up spiritual sacrifices, the nature of which is

not further specified. There are two relevant passages in Philippians: 'if I am offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy' (2₁₇) (this is a difficult verse: I merely give the conventional translation) and 'having received from Epaphroditus the things that came from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God' (4₁₈). The climax to this line of thought is found in Romans 12₁, the verse that marks the transition, as it were, from 'theology' to 'ethics' in that epistle: 'I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service' (λογικὴν λατρείαν). Thus in Paul the sacrifice which *we* offer, doubtless in dependence on the sacrifice which Christ offers, is our faith, our charitable gifts, our σώματα, our whole personalities. Here there is nothing cultic; sacrifice is not something offered primarily within the walls of a church or meeting-house; it is as wide as life itself. The cultic acts, such as the praise of God with the lips, are not referred to, but they are not excluded; it is fair to say that a cultic term is used in a non-cultic way, a word used originally of specific acts of religious devotion is used of that wider devotion or worship which should characterize our whole life; the word is not merely spiritualized, but broadened; life itself is the true worship.

In Hebrews, however, the word appears twice in one passage; the first time in a more cultic, and the second in a more general sense. 'Through him [i.e. Christ] then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. But to do good and to communicate [that means to share one's goods with others] forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased' (13₁₅₋₁₆). Thus works of charity and vocal praise are alike sacrifice. 'Worship' and 'life', as we call them, are not separate, but forms of the same thing.

I ought for the sake of completeness to refer to the only other instance of this word in Paul, apart from those I mentioned earlier; this is 1 Corinthians 10₁₈: 'Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar?' This passage occurs in a rather delicate argument about idolatry; it does not describe the service of Holy Communion as a sacrifice, but it speaks of it and pagan sacrifice in the same breath, as though there is for the purpose of the argument some sort of analogy between them. Somewhat similar points arise if we consider the uses of the word θυσιαστήριον, 'altar', and the verb θύω, 'I sacrifice'.

We could get somewhat similar results by considering the word λατρεία, 'service', which we have already encountered in the 'reasonable service' of Romans 12₁. The corresponding verb is fairly common in the Septuagint, and translates words connected with 'ebed, more often rendered παῖς, servant, or δούλος, slave. The associations of the word λατρεία thus do not seem to be primarily cultic, but its meaning has a cultic fringe. The English word 'service' is much the same: we talk of rendering Christian service, but also of going to divine service or to the service. Similarly, German, which has no convenient word for 'worship', uses *Gottesdienst*, God-service, which is usually taken to mean that we serve God, but can also bear the meaning that God serves us.

Passing over *θρησκεία*, I come to the very interesting word *leitourgia*. This word has an indubitably secular origin. In it we can see the roots which have

given us *λαός*, 'people', and *ἔργον*, 'work'. Of course, the word *λαός* is found in the biblical phrase, 'people of God', that true laity to which Christian ministers and Christian laymen [in our modern use of the term] alike belong. *λειτουργία* then means a public work. But this is to dwell on the Greek antecedents of the word, which nowadays we are often told we must not do; and, after all, even the most cultic terms connected with sacrifice have secular origins, notions of burning, cutting, slaying, and so on, if you go back far enough. The point is that in the Old Testament the word *λειτουργία* had come to have undeniably cultic meanings; thus for example, in Numbers 8₂₂: 'And after that went the Levites in to do their service [*λειτουργεῖν τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν*] in the tent of meeting before Aaron.' It renders various Hebrew roots, one of which is 'ebed, which we have already considered, but there are others. Now, this word and its cognates occur fifteen times in the New Testament, not as often as *θυσία* and its cognates. But the distribution of its meanings is much the same; it is used in descriptions of the Jewish cult; it is used of Christ's ministry ('now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent', Heb 8₆); it is used by Paul three times in Philippians 2, mostly in connexion with what that church had or had not done for him, one of these uses being in that same difficult verse in which we have already found the word 'sacrifice' (2₁₇); in 2 Corinthians 9₁₂ it is used in connexion with another charitable gift, and somewhat similarly in Romans 15₂₇. There are two interesting uses in Romans which are not paralleled in the uses of *θυσία*; Paul calls himself a minister; the verse is laden with cultic language, but I think it is fair to say that it is not used in a specifically cultic sense; the verse is Romans 15₁₆, 'that I should be a minister [*λειτουργον*, not *διάκονον*, which would be less cultic] of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, ministering [*ἰεουργοῦντα*] the gospel of God, that the offering up [*προσφορά*] of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost'. That may be called a religious, though not a cultic, use of the word; but in another passage, also in Romans, we have it used in a way which brings religion into what would often be called a secular matter, the paying of taxes. Paul is speaking of obedience to the powers that be, and he goes on: 'For this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are *λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ* [ministers of God's service], attending continually to this very thing' (13₆); the income tax people are God's liturgists, and very keen and persistent on the job. Paul the evangelist to the Gentiles and the civil servant at his desk are alike ministers, performing a *λειτουργία*; and so we speak of a minister of the gospel and a minister of the crown. Here again religion and life are all of a piece; religion is not just what you do in church.

I pause to remark that one reason why there is no use of any cognate of *θυσία* to correspond to these last uses of *λειτουργός* is that the word for a man who offers sacrifice is not any part of *θυσία*, but 'priest'; and if this term were similarly investigated we should find it has similar broad uses; it points to the priesthood of all believers rather than to the individual performing cultic acts, though we have seen one of its cognates, *ἰεουργοῦντα*, used of an individual's evangelistic work in a verse already quoted.

Now this evidence all points the same way; in the New Testament the true sacrifice, the true service, the true liturgy, lies in the whole people of God offering to God not just a weekly hour of devotion, but the service of their whole

lives. And this we know to be right. We must never commend our services by asking men to 'spare an hour for God': He claims every hour.

II

How, then, did the New Testament writers speak when they wanted to describe what we call Christian worship? They could, of course, refer, to the various forms which the worship took, as in that first description of the early Church in Acts 2₄₂: 'And they continued stedfastly [the same word, incidentally, that was used for the tax-collectors] in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.' But there is no general word to describe worship. And because there is no general word in the Greek, there is no uniformity in other languages: German, as we have seen, uses 'service,' *Gottesdienst*; French uses *le culte*, which had different associations. What do we say? 'I am going to service' (like the German); 'I am going to Church'; but the emphasis must be on being the Church; when we say we go to Church, we tend to mean the church building, a secondary sense of the word; 'I am going to chapel'; useful in certain contexts but unsuitable for general use. 'I am going to worship' a little formal perhaps, but 'public worship,' 'divine worship', the 'worship-service' (as the Americans say), these undoubtedly are the correct phrases for what we do. But they are a peculiarly English invention; many writers have started their expositions of this theme by saying that worship really is worth-ship and means our recognition of the worth or value of God. This is true, but a rather insular way of putting it; distrust a theological point which cannot be translated into Greek.

This variety in the ways in which the European languages describe what happens in the church building reflects the embarrassment (we might almost say) of the New Testament writers who, having used up the words that mean worship in order to describe life, are left without words to describe worship. Yet we know that they did worship not only from many incidental allusions, but also from specific instructions about it, notably in 1 Corinthians. How, then, did Paul describe it? The answer is that in seven passages in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 he uses the word *συνέρχομαι*, 'to come together' or 'to gather together', sometimes with interesting additions, such as *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* (11₂₀, 14₂₃), which also means 'together' in a rather technical way, or *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ* (11₁₈) 'in Church', which in such a context does not refer to the building but the nature of the assembly. We can also find in the New Testament examples of *συνάγω* in the passive, gathered together, as in Acts 20, in verse 7 and again in verse 8, of the gathering from which Eutychus fell out of the window. The word is also used in 1 Corinthians 5₄ of a Church gathered together, not so much for worship as for discipline. But the supreme example is Matthew 18₂₀: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' I do not propose to investigate the Hebrew words which are translated by *συνάγω* in the Septuagint, for there are fifty of them; but there is of course a Jewish institution which lies behind this—namely, the synagogue. It would be going altogether too far to say that *συνέρχομαι* or *συνάγομαι* means 'worship', but they are used in connexion with worship, which was the chief, though not the only, purpose for which the Church was gathered; and thus our Methodist way of speaking of a gathering, which has a rather homely sound, is shown to

have biblical authority. Later, indeed, the word *synaxis*, which does not occur in the Greek Bible, came into use among Christians, to describe their gatherings, whether or not these were sacramental, but especially that service of the word which came to precede the Holy Communion. Clearly they could not call it *συναγωγή*, though it had some resemblance to the synagogue service, and *synaxis* filled the gap.

In this linguistic usage I believe that we have a clue to the significance of worship in the usual sense of the word. Worship is a gathering together, a concentrated expression, of that spirit and attitude which should suffuse the whole Christian life. I do not suggest that the words *συνέρχομαι* and *συνάγομαι* imply all this; but I think that there is a real connexion between the two ideas; when the Church is gathered into one place, it gathers into one series of acts, into one hour or so, the spirit which in a more diffused way its members should always maintain; when the members are concentrated into one small portion of space, then they give concentrated expression to the whole nature of their faith.

It is of vital importance that we should impress on our people such a conception of worship. The man in the street has grasped all too readily the notion that to work is to pray, that he can worship God upon the golf-course, and so forth. Liberal religion (in the pejorative sense of 'liberal') welcomes the notion that true piety is of this diffuse kind; as the *Methodist Hymn-book* (911) puts it:

*To worship rightly is to love each other,
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.*

Modern man has eagerly seized on this notion of a religion which leaves him his Sundays free; and, quite apart from the decline in Church membership, I believe that fewer people come to our services because our members themselves do not regard public worship, as once they did, as the supreme duty and privilege of their lives, which only extreme necessity would induce them to omit on the Lord's Day.

Now we shall not counter these notions of 'the holier worship which He deigns to bless' (to quote Whittier again) by denying the element of truth in this idea. The notion that the true sacrifice, service, and liturgy are to be found in the dedication of the whole of life is, as we have seen, deeply rooted in the New Testament itself. We do not need to disparage this notion of worship, but we need to reply when its supporters make exclusive claims for it; we need only point out that in New Testament times it was never for a moment supposed that this more diffuse worship was the only kind of worship; it was taken for granted, as their practice shows, that it would be accompanied by, or, as I should say, find its concentrated expression in, particular gatherings. Indeed, we may say that the necessity for these is rooted in the whole notion of the scandal of particularity or the incarnational principle. Is it going too far to say that the service of worship is the embodiment of the spirit of worship as Jesus Christ is the embodiment of God?

Once this principle is grasped, then a stress on the spirit of worship in daily life is all to the good. It is notable that those circles which in our time have contributed most to the revived interest in worship have almost invariably laid great stress on its connexion with the daily and particularly with the

industrial life of man, sometimes indeed using theories about the offertory which seems to me rather dubious. It is true that Churches whose worship was somewhat formalized and clericalized could most easily find new life in this way, and the perils which have beset our worship have not been exactly the same; others have needed more emphasis on the diffuse worship; we have needed more emphasis on the concentrated worship; but among others concentrated worship has not suffered, but rather gained, by the new emphasis on the diffuse; we may therefore infer that if we lay more emphasis on the duty of specific acts of worship we are not in any great danger of losing our contact with daily life. There can indeed be a pietistic concentration on the sweet and pleasurable thrills of individual religious emotional experience just as dangerous as absorption in liturgical, ceremonial, and sartorial minutiae, but neither of these perils need prevent us from laying stress on that concentrated worship of God which lies in particular seasons of devotion, without which the Christian life would speedily lose its savour.

III

The argument which I have tried to deduce from the New Testament itself may be supported by other more philosophical approaches to the question. Some human activities are means to an end. A man may enjoy driving a bus, but normally he drives it as a means to an end, primarily to get passengers to places, secondarily, and only secondarily, we hope, to earn profits for his firm and a living for himself; he may enjoy it; he may do it in a spirit of worship; but the activity is a means to an end. Many activities, indeed, have a tangible end-product: the baker makes bread; the carpenter, tables. But talking to a friend or going to a concert usually has no end-product; it does, indeed, have a useful result; one feels refreshed and stimulated; but one does not do it for the sake of the result; one does it because one enjoys it; it is an end in itself. And so it is in our intercourse with God; we may ask Him to do something, but we do not use Him for a certain end; that would be magic. We simply enjoy Him. This bears fruit, indeed, in conduct; it saves our life of service from becoming patronizing and self-centred; but we do not worship God in order to improve our character; we worship Him because He is supremely worshipful; the activity of worship in one sense is useless; it has no end-product; it serves no useful purpose; from one point of view, it is a waste of time. But what is the use of asking what is the use? Worship needs no justification beyond itself; it is not a manipulation of psychological stimuli; we do not worship on Sunday in order to live better lives on Monday; we give concentrated expression on Sunday to that worship which will also characterize our Monday: we must not go too far the other way and say that Sunday worship is the end and that daily life is the means to it; the terminology of means and ends is valuable chiefly as a warning; we fall into many mistakes by thinking, sometimes rather subconsciously, of worship as a means. A more useful expression is the word 'expression'. Worship, we have already said, is a concentrated expression of something to be found also in daily life. And I believe that this covers also the outward forms and styles of worship. We usually judge these by asking, in effect, whether they are psychologically helpful; we should do better to ask whether they are a fitting expression of our worship. A prophetic religion

must always be aware of the dangers that attach to them, but a religion that is also incarnational must know that the embodiment of worship is also part of worship. We cannot just detach the kernel of true worship from the husk in which it is embodied. The spirit of worship and its expression are intimately linked.

Another way of putting this is to ask which of our present activities will continue in heaven; not social service, not evangelism, but worship. The book of Revelation tells us that there will be no temple there, not because life will contain no worship, but because it will be all worship. It is thus above all in worship that we are preparing ourselves for heaven; worship is a foretaste, an anticipation, an antepast of heaven. We do not approve of those who tell us that they have enjoyed the service as if it were an entertainment, but the service should be full of festal joy. We must indeed lament the sins we commit while we are still exiled in Babylon, and pray for our fellow-captives; yet even in this strange land we sing the Lord's song, the song of Zion, we know the joy and exultation, the *χαρά* and *ἀγαλλίασις* of which the New Testament speaks. Is not this the meaning of realized eschatology? Someone has daringly described worship as an eschatological game. It is eschatological because it anticipates the coming age; it is more akin to play with its zest, joy, exuberance, and freedom than to work with its toil and sweat and concern for the end-product. This may sound like escapism; but the true worship of Him who came to seek and to save the lost cannot fail to send us forth in renewed mission.

IV

And that leads me into a very important qualification of what I have been saying; for mission involves preaching, and preaching is part of worship, and preaching has, of course, an end-product, the conversion of the sinner or the strengthening of the saint. Some who are not Methodists (though not the wisest representatives of other communions) may be tempted to say that that just shows that preaching is not part of worship, but just a preliminary to it, a kind of preparation for baptism, after which the true life of worship starts. I would remind them that Paul speaks of the Lord's Supper as itself a proclamation. 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim [*καταγγέλλετε*] the Lord's death till he come' (1 Cor 11₂₆). Worship is proclamation as well as response, offer as well as acceptance, means of grace as well as sacrifice of praise; and as God always takes the initiative, it is the former in each pair which is logically prior.

There are, I believe, four stages in the whole process, subsequent to the mighty acts of God which wrought our salvation. First, there is the proclamation of those acts by the Church in every kind of witness and evangelism, including that proclamation of the *kerygma* beyond the walls of the church, or, rather, outside the gathering of the Church, which aims at converting men so that they become members of the Church, as in Acts 2 (no doubt in a Christian or post-Christian society practising infant baptism all this has to be phrased somewhat differently); secondly, there is the proclamation of the Gospel within the Christian gathering itself; this serves both to instruct catechumens and to stimulate the devotion of the faithful; it comes to focus in the preaching, which preaching serves as a kind of norm for less formal proclamation outside the gathering, but this proclamatory aspect suffuses the

whole service, including the Lord's Supper itself; thirdly, there is that response to this which occurs in divine worship itself; adult baptism may be included here, as it is a cultic response to catechetical preaching; here also we may include the outward sign of conversion when someone, as we say, responds to an appeal; the already converted Christian makes the cultic response by what the Bible calls the sacrifice of praise—that is, by those parts of worship such as hymns and prayers which are more specifically directed towards God, with which we must include also confession, intercession, dedication, and the like; but this aspect of worship also should suffuse the whole; fourthly, the response outside the cult or the gathering—that is, being a Christian, a layman in the true sense, a member of the people of God in the world, offering the sacrifice of our souls and bodies in daily life. Between stages three and four private devotion serves as a sort of bridge.

Now certain types of so-called 'Catholic' worship tend to view the first two stages as preliminary to the third, the offering of sacrifice in worship; preliminary instruction there must be, but that is no part of worship proper; true worship is the offering of our sacrifice of praise, especially (they say) in the Eucharist; daily living flows from this as best it can, though nowadays by what seems to me an inversion of the true order daily living itself is regarded as a sort of prelude to the Eucharist, to be offered at the Offertory and so caught up into the true sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of Christ sacramentally present which is thus also our sacrifice. On the other hand, the Protestant or Evangelical view perhaps sometimes tends to stress only stages two and four; there is great and proper emphasis on proclamation, especially the preaching which occurs in the service itself; scanty interest is taken in the cultic response to this, the sacrifice of praise: what God wants is our hearts and lives rather than our lips; so the element of response which follows the proclamation is reduced simply to a concluding hymn and benediction (two generations ago, I think the collection also was taken at this point in our Methodist services), and by a curious inversion, in order to make the preaching the climax, the cultic response to it, consisting largely of four hymns and two prayers, precedes it even though we no longer describe this as the 'preliminaries', which was the extreme form of this inversion. What does the cultic response matter, we have thought, when we ought to be hastening out to do God's will in the world?

Now each of these positions is right in what it emphasizes, wrong when it diminishes the importance of any of these four items. Therefore the two traditions can in principle be combined without the slightest loss to either; indeed, each tradition at its best avoids these errors which I have described or caricatured and knows already the just balance of these various elements. Where will you find it better than in Charles Wesley's hymns?

This further complicates the question of the name of this activity. The words 'worship', 'liturgy', 'sacrifice', all refer to response rather than to proclamation; so does service, unless we think as I have suggested, of God's service to us as well as our service to God; 'sermons', as they describe the Sunday school anniversary in Lancashire, and 'means of grace' emphasize the proclamation, but not the response. The phrase 'preaching-service' tries to capture both, as does the archaic 'diet of worship'. Perhaps we had better stick to 'gathering'. But the point is that the gathering must present in concentrated or gathered form *both*

that proclamation of God's unrepeatable mighty acts which the Church more diffusely makes in all its evangelical endeavour and in the lives of its witnessing people *and* that response which the Church more diffusely makes in those same lives.

V

There is one final turn in the argument. I used to think that these two aspects of the gathering could be clearly distinguished. The lessons, the sermon, the children's address, the notices are the proclamation; the hymns, the prayers, the offertory are the response. This scheme is harder to apply to the Lord's Supper, though I think certain fundamental questions about its structure might be advantageously considered in these categories. I still think that our services might be improved by closer attention to the question whether at any given moment we are addressing God or man. This, for instance, would condemn the homiletic character of those prayers which try to 'get at' the congregation. And the fact that proclamation is logically prior to response has a bearing on the order of the items in the preaching-service, as the recommendations of the Conference report show.

But I now see that there is a profounder truth than this, at which I have already hinted by saying that both proclamation and response should suffuse the whole. This truth might be approached by considering the difficulty of classifying on this basis, not merely some hymns, but many psalms; are they lessons to be read or hymns to be sung? It might be approached by considering the word *ἀνάμνησις*: are we bringing something to the remembrance of God or of men? Possibly a consideration of the role of the Holy Spirit in worship might lead to the same conclusion. The way, however, in which I want to approach this fresh truth is this: There is a certain danger and a certain difficulty in thinking of proclamation and response as two separate and successive moments in worship. Take the act of preaching, which, if anything is, is proclamation. But while the preacher is preaching, the congregation in their hearts, though not yet with their lips or with their daily lives, are already responding. And what of the preacher? How did he get his message? He listened to God; and the very act of preaching is his response to what God has already told him. He is not God; he is a man responding to God, even though from the congregation's point of view he is God's ambassador, God's lieutenant. Thus proclamation carries within itself response; it does not merely evoke subsequent response; indeed, even to attend the means of grace is already a response. Now, what of that part of the service which we should normally call response? Is this also proclamation? In a sense it is; by doing it we bear our witness to others; men will hear our praises and long to join us; and certainly the further response of our daily lives is also an act of witness. But we may become too self-conscious if we think much about that. The matter is best approached this way: if we think of proclamation and response as two successive acts, we tend to think of proclamation as something which God does, albeit through His representative, the preacher, and of response as something which *we* do. God stops, as it were, and we take over; now it is up to us; the means of grace have empowered us; now let us show our gratitude and live the Christian life as best we can till the time comes for us to return to the means of grace once more.

But this is most sadly to misconceive the whole situation. As we are sinners,

the sacrifice of our praise and our souls and bodies is in itself quite unacceptable to God. But here the very word 'sacrifice', at first sight so dangerous and suggestive of a Pelagian reliance on our own effort, reminds us of the true sacrifice, the unique sacrifice of Christ; that was acceptable to God, and that was done for us. (And indeed the sacrifices of the Old Covenant in their provisional, transitory, unsatisfactory way, were quite as much God's gracious provision for our salvation as our own human attempt to atone for sin.) Moreover, it is Christ who still pleads our cause and who dwells within us; and we are in Him, members of His Body, crucified and raised together with Him. Now these truths, bewildering in the rich profusion of their imagery, transform the whole situation. The one thing in the gathering which seems our own work—namely, our response—is just as much performed by Christ as was the preaching or for that matter the mighty acts themselves. It is not just that our meaner praises are joined to the worship of angels and archangels and the whole company of heaven and then joined in some way to the perfect worship and obedience which the Son offers to the Father, but that in some sense Christ's own worship is carried on through us. For we do no good thing on our own. 'All things come of thee', said David in 1 Chronicles, (29₁₄), and the Psalmist said of the Lord; 'He hath put a new song in my mouth, even praise unto our God' (Ps 40₃). And something of this we indicate when we say, 'through Jesus Christ our Lord'. We pray not in our name, but in His.

Thus all that we do in the gathering partakes to some extent of the character of both proclamation and response, and thus by a kind of *communicatio idiomatum* we may after all call it by the name appropriate to either. It is both God's action and our action. So, to use the phrase which Luther used of the real presence, 'in, with and under' our poor halting services and sermons God speaks and acts. We may even dare to compare this with the way in which God speaks through the errors and confusions of Scripture. God's action and ours must not be confused, and yet they cannot be separated; and now, by using the language of Chalcedon I have hinted at a comparison with Christ Himself, and here the analogy falters, for we must not compare the faults and imperfections of our worship with His human nature; yet when we speak of our worship, directed to man as proclamation and to God as response, we cannot but think of the two natures of Him who was God revealed to man and Representative of men to God. This, like almost all that we can say about worship, is true of life itself. 'Not I', says Paul, 'but the grace of God which was with me' (1 Cor 15₁₀); but this general truth that Christ dwells in us and acts through us is expressed in worship in a gathered and concentrated way, and gives the explanation of its two-sided character.

We must not, then, hesitate to summon our people to attend each Lord's Day that gathering of the Church which is not to be sharply separated from daily witness and the daily offering of soul and body and which yet both as means of grace and as sacrifice of praise is the supreme duty and privilege of the Christian life, nor must we lightly esteem the privilege and responsibility of conducting it; so, as the Bible exhorts us all. 'let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh' (Heb 10₂₄₋₅.)

WILLIAM LAW

Eric W. Baker

THE YEAR 1961 marks the bicentenary of the death of William Law. After 200 years he is best known—I had almost written, 'only known'—as the author of *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, which work has an acknowledged place among the classics of English devotional literature.

Law, however, wrote many books, and some would even question whether the *Serious Call* is the greatest. Furthermore, the development of his thought, as outlined in Stephen Hobhouse's *William Law and Eighteenth-century Quakerism*, affords a most fascinating study of a character whom a recent writer, the Rev. A. W. Hopkinson, describes as 'this English prophet, a prophet not only for the eighteenth century but also for the twentieth'.

William Law was born in 1686 at Kingscliffe in Northamptonshire, where he was also to spend his later years. He came of a good middle-class family. After a serious and devout upbringing, he entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, as a sizar in 1705, graduating as a B.A. in 1708. He was elected to a Fellowship in 1711, in which year he also took Holy Orders. He became an M.A. in 1712 and appeared to be launched on a brilliant and successful career when, by refusing to take the oath of allegiance to King George I, he forfeited his Fellowship in 1716, and with it all prospect of advancement in the Church. This action on his part, which was in marked contrast to the aptitude for compromise at the expense of principle displayed by many of his contemporaries, affords ample evidence alike of his intellectual honesty and his sensitive conscience. A further anticipation of what was to come was furnished by the 'Rules for my Future Conduct', drawn up on his entering the University and found among his papers. This document, comprising some eighteen principles of practical piety, taken in conjunction with certain prayers of his which have also survived from this period, shows that the seeds were already present of what was to come to full flower in the *Christian Perfection* and the *Serious Call*.

Little is known of Law's whereabouts during the next few years, but it is probable that he lived quietly in London. In 1717 he published the *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*. These letters, addressed to the latitudinarian Dr Hoadly, contain the essence of the High Church position, and constitute the first phase of Law's churchmanship. In them he insists on the absolute necessity of a strict apostolic succession in order to constitute a Christian priest, and complains to the bishop: 'You have left us neither Priests, nor Sacraments, nor Church'. This was followed in 1721 by *Remarks upon 'The Fable of the Bees'*, which concerned the origin of the moral sense.

It was probably about the year 1723 that Law accepted the post of tutor to the son of Mr Gibbon of Putney. In 1726 he published *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection*. In this work he included almost without alteration a

tract on the stage published earlier in the same year, entitled *The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage-Entertainment Fully Demonstrated*. Three years later, in 1729, there appeared *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, Adapted to the State and Condition of all Orders of Christians*.

These two works represent the second phase of Law's outlook, and reveal a remarkable change of emphasis. Instead of the ecclesiastical purist of the Bangorian letters, we discover a man dominated by a consuming passion for the ethical implications of his religion. As the title of the first suggests, they are great practical treatises on the Christian way of life. Their whole plea is that the essence of Christianity consists not in the formal execution of outward ordinances, but in the consecration of the whole life to God. So great a transformation does this appear when placed side by side with the Bangorian letters that it is impossible to demur when Mr Hobhouse describes it as being necessarily caused by 'something in the nature of a conversion'.

In 1737 Law's old friend, Mr Gibbon, died. Law, however, appears to have remained in town until 1740 when he took up residence at Kingscliffe. For a few years he lived alone, but in 1744 was joined by his two friends, Miss Hester Gibbon and Mrs Hutcheson, to whom also he acted as spiritual adviser. There Law spent the rest of his life. From such scanty material as has remained, we get the impression of a somewhat shy and retiring man—it is significant that there is no authentic portrait of Law in existence—living in fact, if not in intention, almost the life of a recluse, seeing very few people outside the narrow circle of Kingscliffe society, attending with exemplary regularity the public ordinances of the Church, maintaining withal a strict devotional discipline in private, studying and reinterpreting the mystical writers, and, together with his two friends, exercising that piety and charity which his own practical discourses enjoined.

Of Law we may say with greater truth than of most writers that we see the man in his writings. 'His works', remarked his biographer Overton, 'were severally and collectively the transcription of his own experience.' The first two phases of this were expressed respectively in the Bangorian Letters and the great practical treatises *Christian Perfection* and the *Serious Call*.

We now turn to the last two phases, each represented by a group of writings, the two groups being separated by an interval of nine years. The first group of writings falls within the years 1737–40. These are the titles and dates—

1737: *A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called 'A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'*

1739: *The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration.*

1740: *An Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr Trapp's Discourse of the Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous Overmuch.*

1740: *An Appeal to all that Doubt, or Disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel, etc.*

1740: *Some Animadversions upon Dr Trapp's late Reply.*

This group of writings represents an intermediate stage in Law's thought. It appears that he was no longer content with the purely ethical Christianity of the *Christian Perfection* and the *Serious Call*.

Law had for long been a diligent reader of the mystic writers. Then about

1736 he became acquainted with the writings of Jacob Boehme, the shoemaker-mystic of Silesia. This proved a turning-point in Law's life and from that time forward he became a lifelong student and disciple of Boehme. As Law himself gradually absorbed the profound and often obscure teachings of Boehme, so he increasingly reinterpreted those teachings in his own writings, and it is in the group of writings of the years 1737-40 that we first discern Boehme's influence. In these works Law reverts to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which had receded into the background in the *Serious Call* period, as of primary importance, without, however, adopting again the strict High Church position of the Bangorian letters. As Mr Hobhouse says:

There it was the 'validity' of the Sacraments, the question as to what body of men should administer them, and the like topics that he was discussing: here he leaves all that on one side, assumes a valid administration, and sets out to interpret the deep significance of these divine mysteries.

In the *Demonstration* Law expounds the truths of Scripture that Christ as our Saviour is the Atonement for Sin and a Principle of Life to all that lay hold on Him. The acknowledgement of these two truths, he maintains, are the two essential parts of the Sacrament, which constitute its whole nature. With this recaptured, though shifted, emphasis on the Sacraments is blended an ever-increasing infusion of mystical thought, derived from Boehme. This group of writings illustrates the steady trend of Law's thought from the extreme High Church position to one approximating (in thought, if not in practising churchmanship) to that of the Quakers, and represents an intermediate stage between that of the *Serious Call* period and Law's ultimate position.

So we pass to the next group of writings, which constitute the final phase of Law's outlook. They are five in number, and the titles and dates are as follows—

- 1749: *The Spirit of Prayer. Part the First.*
- 1750: *The Spirit of Prayer. Part the Second.*
- 1752: *The Way to Divine Knowledge.*
- 1752: *The Spirit of Love. Part the First.*
- 1752: *The Spirit of Love. Part the Second.*

It will be seen that, like the earlier group, these were all written within a few years of each other, but that the earliest of them is separated by an interval of no less than nine years from the latest work of the earlier group we have been considering. This was a period of meditation and study, at the end of which Law's theological and ecclesiastical position, now finally settled, was expounded by him in the five above-mentioned works. Mr Hobhouse describes these as Law's five most important books, containing 'one harmonious system of thought—Law's final and considered views on creeds and sacraments, on the Incarnation and the Atonement, on the universe and God'. Law's later writings after 1756 reveal no fresh development of thought, and indeed show a certain deterioration in style and treatment.

In the period of the two practical discourses Law's main emphasis had been on the common duties of man. 'Here . . . while these duties are assumed, it is the inward states of the soul and the manner of God's revelations to the soul,

which are all-important'. The Sacraments which, as we saw, had regained prominence in the earlier groups of writings of this 1738-56 period, as having supreme mystical significance, recede once more into the background. The outward ceremony has only a value in so far as it can stir up within us the spirit of prayer and love. Two quotations seem to illustrate this:

You should, once for all, mark and observe where and what the true Nature of Religion is; for here it is plainly shown you that its Place is within; its Work and Effect is within; its Glory, its Life, its Perfection, is all within; it is merely and solely the raising a new life, a new Love, and a new Birth, in the inward Spirit of our Hearts.

And with a contrast explicitly drawn between outward ordinances and the regenerating work of the Spirit within,

all religion is but a dead work, unless it be the work of the Spirit of God; and that sacraments, prayers, singing, preaching, hearing, are only so many ways of being fervent in the spirit, and of giving up ourselves more and more to the inward working, enlightening, quickening, sanctifying Spirit of God within us; and all for this end, that the curse of the Fall may be taken from us, that death may be swallowed up in victory, and a true, real, Christ-like nature formed in us, by the same Spirit, by which it was formed in the Holy Virgin Mary.

Such was the religious transition through which Law passed in the years 1738-56.

William Law is of especial interest to Methodists because of his influence on John Wesley at a critical stage in the latter's spiritual history. It may well be that through this influence rather than through any direct impact of his own upon the public, Law made his biggest contribution to English religion. Wesley himself describes it thus: 'In 1727 I read Mr Law's *Christian Perfection* and *Serious Call*, and more explicitly resolved to be all devoted to God in body, soul, and spirit.' Very soon not only Law's writings, but the man himself, could become a source of enlightenment and inspiration. Law became 'a kind of oracle' to Wesley. This is Law's own phrase in a letter of February 1756, and Wesley acknowledges its truth in his letter to the *London Chronicle* in September 1760. There is abundant evidence that this description is no exaggeration. Two of John Wesley's earliest biographers, Coke and Moore, writing in the year after his death, were equally emphatic: 'This considerable writer was the great forerunner of the revival which followed, and did more to promote it than any other individual whatsoever; yea, more perhaps than the rest of the nation collectively taken.' Dr Trapp, the eminent contemporary of Law and Wesley, and an opponent of both, described Law as the parent of the Methodists, and John Wesley himself agreed that there was some truth in this description. In later days Dr G. A. Wauer has called Law 'the father of the English revival of the eighteenth century, and the grandfather of Methodism'. Similarly, Miss Evelyn Underhill writes: 'Law has a certain right to be called the spiritual father of Methodism.'

Unhappily, the two men became estranged, largely as a result of Law's conversion to mysticism, which was abhorrent to Wesley. There was an interchange of letters in 1738, shortly after Wesley's vital evangelical experience. These letters, with their charges and countercharges, did nothing to resolve the quarrel, and the breach between the two men was never healed.

In spite of this, however, the fact remains that Law appears to have been mainly responsible for that moral awakening of Wesley which prepared the way for his later evangelical experience. It may fairly be argued that without the former the latter would never have occurred.

It is a thousand pities that, apart from the *Serious Call*, Law should have been so neglected in the intervening years. The time is surely ripe for a new edition of his complete works. The only existing edition, in nine volumes, dates from 1762. It may occasionally be available in second-hand bookshops, but, with its arbitrary sprinkling of italics and capitals and its queer punctuation, it is difficult to read. In 1950 the Rev. Arthur W. Hopkinson undertook the abridgement of three books, the *Christian Perfection*, the *Appeal*, and the *Spirit of Prayer*. These are now published by the Epworth Press under the title, *The Pocket William Law*, and afford a useful introduction to Law for new readers.

For those interested in the relation of Law to Wesley and the beginnings of Methodism, two recent works are available which treat the subject comprehensively: *John Wesley and William Law*, by the Rev. J. Brazier Green, and *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival*, by the present writer. Both these were published by the Epworth Press and are readily obtainable. *William Law, a Study in Literary Craftsmanship*, by Henri Talon (Rockliff), approaches the subject from a different viewpoint, and seeks to show how the development of Law's ideas is reflected in the perfecting of his literary style.

The above necessarily brief sketch reveals Law as an outstanding churchman of the eighteenth century. It is to be hoped that the occasion of his bicentenary will help to revive interest in one who made a contribution all his own to the religious thought of England at that period.

Recent Literature

EDITED BY JOHN T. WILKINSON

Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek, by Thorlief Boman. Translated from the German by J. L. Moréau. (S.C.M. Press, 21s.)

'Is there more Greek than Hebrew in our Christianity?' The question used often to be asked, and the usual answer given will now be, 'Hebrew; but the skeins are often hard to unravel.' Mr Boman's work takes a different direction. The skeins may be interwoven; by what we need is some study of the leading words in both Testaments, like *hayah*, *dabhar*, *selem*; let the text and the lexicons give us the answer. Both the Hebrews and the Greeks had their way of thinking of the world; but the Hebrew thought was 'dynamic'; the Greek 'static': thought of things as they move, and of things as they are. *Hayah*, for instance, does not denote mere existence, but coming or having come to be in such a state of performing, such a function. The word *dabhar* comes nearest of Hebrew words to meaning a 'thing'. It goes forth from the speaker and accomplishes what it was intended to do. The impression, image, or *selem*, is not of shape or form or colour, but of function, as is seen when we contemplate the ark, the temple, or even man as *imago Dei*. The author, who half says something reminding him of the Hebrew in Heraclitus, with his flux and strife, is much more impressed with the unmoving forms of Plato. He is less at ease with the passage from *hyle* to *energeia* in Aristotle. He is untouched by the question which lay at the root of all Greek philosophic thought: Whence comes, and what is, motion? Nor is he troubled by the view of Aristotle, carried on or transformed by Aquinas, of what we call God, the mover of all things, though Himself unmoved. So with the 'Israelite' stress on time, the Greek on space. Mr Boman's book is suggestive; he has illuminated it with a number of striking quotations, and he has certainly picked up a number of pebbles from the crowded beach explored in Kittel's *New Testament Dictionary*, which includes, indeed, what is really a most valuable Hebrew lexicon. What we do not find is any recognition, save in a few hasty implications, that the Old Testament is a library of books stretching over 1,000 years, with writers as different from one another as Piers Plowman from John Henry Newman, while on the Greek side, the author, who is rather uncertain on Homer and the pre-Homerics, only deals carefully with one writer, Plato, although he gives considerable attention to Kant. The Hebrew scholar (and such Mr Boman seems to have in mind) will be distressed that the transliterator refused to recognize any difference between long, short, and composite vowels; and some discussion of the 'waw converseive', and of the uses of the infinitive absolute and construct, would have been in place. On the other hand, we cannot but be grateful for his trenchant criticism of what is often gaily called the anthropomorphic view of Jahveh. Both the Bibliography and the indices extend over seven pages; and the friends of the late Canon Quick will rejoice at the respect with which that talented writer is treated. And, to sum up, if with reference to Nils Bohr and the 'unitariness of opposite manifestations of a phenomenon', we find that Hebrew and Greek thinking were complementary—illogical, but correct—we would have given something for the reminder of the contrast between Plato's myth of the cave or his final modest reference in the *Republic* to making friends with god, and the magnificent confidence of Psalm 103 and Psalm 139.

W. F. LOFHOUSE

The Concept of Man: a Study in Comparative Philosophy, by S. Radhakrishnan and P. T. Raju. (Allen & Unwin, 42s.)

Radhakrishnan, well known in the West as one of the foremost interpreters of Indian philosophy and religion, is convinced that a major need of our time is a comparative evaluation of Eastern and Western philosophical thought. Such an evaluation is attempted in *The Concept of Man*, which owes much to his inspiration and guidance. The main work, however, has been undertaken by his co-editor, Professor P. T. Raju, who has written the Introduction, the chapter on Man in Indian Thought, and the final chapter of Comparisons and Reflections. The three remaining chapters of the book, dealing with Greek, Jewish and Chinese concepts of man respectively, have been written by recognized specialists in those fields. The book aims, not altogether successfully, to be a basic work for comparative philosophy, useful as a guide to university students taking courses in the study of man. Yet it leaves out of account some of the most important evaluations of man in the history of human thought. Professor Raju's reasons for this omission are hardly justifiable. Though the Christian concepts of man owe much to Jewish and Greek traditions, they are distinctive and have had a dominating influence on Western thought. The recognition of evil in the centre of human personality, which no human achievement, evolution or self-realization can overcome, is scarcely touched on in this book. Professor Raju does well to remind us that 'a philosophical tradition is not one system of philosophy, but several. It is very easy to forget this and to ask what does Chinese, Indian, or Greek philosophy say about this or that problem' (p.306). It needs considerable skill to compress within the limits of a chapter the various ideas concerning man which have developed through 2,000 or 3,000 years within a philosophical tradition. For instance, the survey of the concept of man in Greek thought deals with the pre-Socratics, Plato, and Aristotle, and the influence of Greek concepts on subsequent religious traditions, whilst the concept of man in Indian thought takes account of the Vedas and Upanishads, Jainism and Buddhism, the great Epics, and the various orthodox Brahmanic schools. The chapters on Greek, Chinese, and Indian thought will repay careful study. That on the Jewish concept of man is least satisfactory. It hardly touches on many important Hebrew concepts concerning man, and in large measure consists of a sermon on the theme that man's significance lies in the fact that 'he is a need of God' (p.119). The final chapter is disappointing. He reveals an inadequate understanding of Chinese philosophical thought in his discussion of 'nature' (p.316), of 'Tao' (p.326) in his over-simplification of the relation of God to man in Confucian and Taoist thought, and in his amazing statement that the idea of immortality entered Chinese thought with Buddhism (p.354). It is unfair to Judaism to say that the relation of man to God is based on the performance of duty. 'I performed my duties, therefore love me.' (p.327). Among the greatest prophets and rabbis love and devotion to God are the spur to duty and righteous living. Also the attempt to divide religions into those of tribal origin and those which are naturalistic and cosmic in their origin is misplaced (p.328). The book is a brave attempt into a comparatively unexplored field, but much more specialist work needs to be done in the concept of man in the various philosophical and religious traditions before we can hope for a really comprehensive and systematic comparative study.

D. HOWARD SMITH

The Christian Morality, by T. E. Jessop. (Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

Professor Jessop has done much in his earlier works to clarify the relationship between the Christian ethic and moral philosophy and we are further in his debt by reason of *The Christian Morality*. It is good to have the philosopher's approach to a subject which is often regarded as the theologian's monopoly. His attack on the doctrine of

total depravity, which must imply the utter unreliability of natural conscience, is refreshing. He sees rightly that if 'fallen' man can do no good, and 'redeemed' man can only do it because God is working in him, then there is no place left for morality. In particular, Professor Jessop attacks Nygren's interpretation of *agapē*. Perhaps there is more to be said for Nygren than Professor Jessop allows. It is always difficult to avoid the extremes of a sentimental interpretation of Christian love and a Stoic one. Professor Jessop clearly avoids the first extreme, but to say that Christian love, 'whether for neighbour or for enemy, is to have a practical concern for him . . . not necessarily coloured with a "nice" feeling', comes near to suggesting that there is no feeling at all in Christian love. This raises the question at least in one reader's mind as to whether Christian morality is based on *neighbourly* love, or on the command, 'as I have loved you, that ye also love one another'. Professor Jessop's exposition of the teaching of Jesus is helpful. So much of the moral teaching is difficult if taken literally (e.g. turning the other cheek, lending to him that asks, cutting off hand or foot) and his treatment helps us to see the challenge. At times, however, one has the uneasy feeling that Jesus intended His teaching to be taken more literally than many of us do. It is too much to ask that when we begin with instructions to those who were willing to take up the cross and follow Christ in the first century we should be able to finish with a carefully balanced and prudent way of life for the twentieth century. Professor Jessop compresses so much into the sentence: 'Christian casuistry is not logical but imaginative.' In the closing chapter on the Christian contribution to morality the temptation of claiming the credit for all moral advance is avoided, while the peculiar contribution of the Christian conscience is made abundantly clear. The book was originally prepared as a series of open lectures at Cambridge and must have provided stimulating fare for the hearer as it offers now to the reader.

BERNARD E. JONES

Science, Technology and the Christian, by C. A. Coulson. (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

This Beckley Lecture provides an interesting and impressive introduction to the problems raised for the Christian by the technological age. Professor Coulson's account of the second industrial revolution is informative and fascinating. The chapter on the moral responsibility of scientists helps us to sympathize with those whose moral decisions are fraught with such dire consequences. On the whole the scientists emerge quite creditably. The responsibility for the uses to which atomic energy is put rests finally upon the shoulders of the politician and upon the common man in so far as he knows what is happening. This is the crux of Professor Coulson's argument. The common man must make it his business to know what is happening. In particular, the Christian must understand something of the changes arising from scientific and technological discoveries. The technologist in his turn must see his responsibilities to society. Problems concerning the use of the world's power, food, and other resources are discussed. There are implications also for family life and education. Science is to play the part of the classics in an earlier generation. The Methodist Minister's probationary studies are criticized for their lack of any reference to science or technology. Undoubtedly, Professor Coulson is right in saying that every child should have acquaintance with science, but perhaps what is needed even more is some kind of total philosophy offered by religious education which will give the child a standard of values. Many people have the 'know-how'; not so many have the 'know-why'. Scientific and technological research is an international field, and Professor Coulson sees the possibility that the peoples of the world will be drawn together by technological advance, upon which the feeding of the hungry finally depends. This book, although dedicated to younger people, would provide an excellent

series of discussions for a men's fellowship, and undoubtedly would be a valuable addition to the Minister's (as well as the Probationer's) book list.

BERNARD E. JONES

Christian Rationalism and Philosophical Analysis, by F. H. Cleobury. (James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 15s.).

The authority of reason in religious matters has been assailed from two sides. Dr Cleobury meets this twofold challenge of the logical positivists who have placed religion outside the realm of reason and of the Barthian theologians who place reason outside the realm of religion. 'The whole argument of this book', he writes, 'is directed against the view, that our intellects are incapable of any valid argument for the existence of God and that rational theology is impossible.' By means of a modified form of Berkeleyan Idealism, he argues for the existence of God. It is an argument based on experience, but depending upon reason for its interpretation. 'Reason without experience would have no content. Experience without reason would have no form—would not be capable of statement in words at all.' The God whose existence is 'proved' is very much akin to the Hegelian Absolute, but Dr Cleobury avoids identifying our individual consciousness with that of the Absolute. The Grace of God manifests itself through the individual, who nevertheless has free choice, and therefore it is quite reasonable to ascribe all the good we do to the Grace of God while accepting responsibility for wrong choices. God is conscious of evil, but 'only within the context of His disapproval'. In dealing with the problem of evil, Dr Cleobury leaves us with an uneasy dualism. The problem, he says, is not *intrinsically* insoluble, but we must avoid grasping at solutions that are too facile. But to say that God is truly 'revealed' by good and distorted by evil seems to be a further facile solution, a statement of faith, rather than a reasoned conclusion. Dr Cleobury's book is welcome for its insistence that reason can take us a long way in religious thought, its offering of a metaphysic compatible with the Christian faith and its brave attempt to reinstate idealism against the opposition of logical positivism.

BERNARD E. JONES

Prophets of the King, by H. F. Mathews. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.).

Prophets of the King (Teacher's Book), by H. F. Mathews. (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

These two books (which together form Book 2 of the King's Way Bible Course for Secondary Schools) can be unreservedly commended, first, to secondary school teachers themselves, for whom they are primarily intended, and, secondly, to those who deal with secondary school children in our Sunday schools and youth fellowships. (The fact that children have worked through a class-book such as the one now under review is an admirable jumping-off ground for a real discussion, provided the leader knows what is in it.) The *Teacher's Book* is an excellent introduction to the Old Testament Prophets for those who have little time to read the larger books. It is clear, direct, and wide-ranging; it takes note of recent studies; and it sets the prophets against the background of their times without losing sight of the fact that the Bible is not just a history book, but the Word of God to us here and now. The actual questions young people ask in the classroom are faced and dealt with straightforwardly (e.g. the nature of leprosy and the wonder-working in the stories of Elijah and Elisha); and the deeper questions of religion are boldly and honestly discussed. The balance of the two books is admirable. The main theme—the origins of prophecy, its development and its flowering in the Great Prophets—is described in simple language in the class-book. Each chapter there has its counterpart in the *Teacher's Book* and is discussed with sufficient fullness for the teacher to see round the subject and to prepare himself to deal with the variety of questions the children are likely to raise. The maps

and charts and illustrations have been carefully chosen and arranged; many suggestions for classroom work are given. There are useful notes on classroom procedure and on co-operation with other departments of the school. The chief value of these books lies in the way Dr Mathews has handled the work of the Prophets so that the teacher can feel he is not just retelling an ancient story, but helping children to understand what religion is really about. This is done in two ways: the actual prophetic experience is made clear, and its relation to the fullness of Jesus's teaching and witness is brought out in text and by chart. The presentation of the material and the work set is suitable for the lower forms in grammar schools and the brighter children in the secondary modern schools. It is less adequate for the children of the middle-intelligence range of the latter schools, who may find the text somewhat beyond them and the work set a little too academic. But the teacher of such children will find the *Teacher's Book* has all the material he needs to build on. One or two of the illustrations could have been clearer (and I myself would have chosen occasionally other subjects to illustrate, e.g. Elijah facing Ahab about Naboth's vineyard rather than the scene on Mount Carmel, and I doubt the usefulness of the reproduction of a painting like Sargent's 'Isaiah' unless it fills a whole page and is in colour). But these are unimportant details in two excellent books.

ALAN T. DALE

Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, by Brevard S. Childs. (S.C.M. Press, 9s. 6d.)

The thesis of this interesting and well-documented study is that while both myth and the Old Testament are at one in seeking to express an understanding of reality the Biblical writers, through Israel's historic experience, developed a concept of reality which caused them to alter the form of the mythical pattern at many points. The manner of this modification is illustrated by a detailed exegesis of six biblical passages. Although one or two of these do not seem especially relevant to the main theme, this section is of great value in itself as offering new insight into familiar but difficult passages, notably Genesis 1₁₋₂ and 3₁₋₅. The author then seeks to show *why* the myth was 'broken' in the ways illustrated by the exegesis. In a suggestive comparison of the mythical and Biblical concepts of time and space, he shows that while the *Urzeit-Endzeit* equation of mythical thought is clearly apparent in the Old Testament, the latter does not think of the 'end' as simply a reversion to the 'beginning' brought about by the primeval event. This is because what happens in between in history, while unimportant to mythical thought, is of profound significance in biblical thought. It is through God's redemptive activity in Israel's history that is revealed that qualitative newness which distinguishes the end from the beginning. What is this new concept of reality? In the concluding section, the answer is stated thus: 'In our opinion, the message of the Old Testament is that the reality is the New Israel.' That which has been implicit from the beginning, but which will be manifest in the end through Israel's history, is the life of covenantal obedience declared by the prophets to be the goal of God's redemptive purpose. The study of Hebrew history and civilization is thus of paramount importance, for it is in and through this that the new reality is to be seen. The criterion for discerning the New Israel in the Old is Jesus Christ—Himself the New Israel, the new reality, in whom the entire Old Testament receives its proper perspective. While the present writer feels that the word 'reality' (always in danger of becoming somewhat unreal!) is rather overworked in these pages, being used in several different senses without prior definition, he believes there is here much food for thought for all students of the Old Testament. It is to be hoped that we shall hear more from Dr Childs on the same theme. A misprint was noted on p.29, line 7, where 'land' should be read for 'law'.

S. C. THEXTON

Isaiah 1₃₀, by J. Yeoman Muckle. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

One of the difficulties in the way of understanding the message of the prophets is that they were men who gave God's word to the people of their own time. This means that a fairly detailed knowledge of the history of Israel is needed before the religious teaching of the prophet can be grasped. With no one is the problem more acute than with Isaiah of Jerusalem, whose ministry was set in the very centre of the political affairs of his nation. Mr Muckle has rightly concentrated on so expounding the book that Isaiah may stand out with full historical realism. But he is not unmindful of the needs of the present day and he has taken care to show the relevance for our own times of this word of God spoken to that far-distant age. He is careful to maintain the balance between an exposition of the text and the giving of those pointers to the use of the book for preaching which is to be expected in a commentary designed for preachers. If one may express a slight disappointment it would be that Mr Muckle seems to reject some of the viewpoints of recent Old Testament study which to the reviewer make the Bible even more alive and exciting, while his homiletic comments occasionally lack pungency. The whole of Isaiah is now covered by two of the Epworth Preacher's Commentaries, and it is to be hoped that many (and not only preachers) will be brought to a renewed study of this great book. CYRIL S. RODD

The Pauline Epistles, Their Meaning and Message, by James T. Hudson. (James Clarke & Co., 21s.)

Every translator has to solve the problem of rendering difficult passages with both faithfulness and clarity. In this book, the author attacks the problem in a novel way. His page is in two columns; the left-hand one gives a paraphrase, the right-hand the translation, with words and phrases missing from the Greek, yet necessary for the argument, included in square brackets. The value of paraphrase in Pauline exegesis, so well demonstrated in the International Critical Commentaries, is here confirmed. The text is clarified, the meaning underlined and lengthy footnotes are avoided. Mr Hudson's square brackets also fulfil a useful purpose. They add to the smoothness of the argument and save constant re-reading to get the sense. So instead of the R.V. 'As touching the gospel, they are enemies for your sake', we read, 'As regards [the spread of] the gospel [the Jews are treated as God's] enemies because of you [gentiles]' (Rom 11_{28a}). On the other hand, the words in brackets sometimes limit and make precise an expression that Paul left deliberately open. 'Rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth' (1 Cor 13_a) is an abstract, but very suggestive statement. Mr Hudson's rendering, 'Finds no pleasure in [others'] sin, but rejoices with the Truth [when it triumphs]', is at the same time both more and less than Paul's. It is more in that it is clearer and more positive. It is less in that it is less flexible and reduces the imaginative scope. When pressed to choose between accuracy and rhythm, Mr Hudson chooses accuracy. Some of Paul's more emotive lines, therefore, show up rather badly, e.g. 2 Timothy 4₂, 'Preach the word, get at it when it suits [others] and when it does not,' and 1 Corinthians 15₃₃, 'For this perishable [nature] must clothe itself with imperishableness'. But this is what the Greek says. In such examples the impossibility of perfect translation is made clear. To translate is to interpret; interpretation can never be exact; there is always room for personal judgement. Mr Hudson, well aware of this, makes his judgements boldly. If some of them fail to carry conviction, it is due less to the fallibility of the author than to the difficulties inherent in his task. The Introduction is brief but full. Mr Hudson has devoured the work of other scholars in this field and his positions are well defended. (There is a particularly good summary of P. N. Harrison's arguments on the Pastorals, though, surprisingly, the author is not convinced.) Here and there alternative points of view might have been given fuller treatment; the

excellent chapter on the Theology of St Paul could well have been longer to satisfy the type of reader the rest of the book assumes; misprints are too common. But altogether this is a learned and useful book. Paul will speak more clearly to those who use it.

W. DAVID STACEY

The Synoptic Gospels, by James Hardy Ropes. (Oxford University Press, 7s. 6d.)

The four lectures in this book, first published posthumously in 1934 by Harvard University Press, have not been easy to obtain in this country. They provide an admirable and well-written introduction to the distinctive features of the Synoptic Gospels showing that a knowledge of the purpose of each of the evangelists is necessary before one can understand the form in which the material has been presented. Mark's Gospel is not a biography, but a theological essay on Jesus as the Messiah and the reasons for His rejection by the Jewish leaders. Matthew, utilizing Marcán and other material, has given a compendium of instruction for Christians of what was known about the deeds and words of Jesus. Luke, regarded as better educated, but less intelligent than Mark or Matthew, has, unlike the other evangelists, written with direct biographical intention and with the purpose of showing that God's saving purpose extended to the Gentiles. As Professor Nineham writes in the Preface, Ropes is more than an excellent guide for beginners: 'These lectures are the fruit of a lifetime's study, and for that reason mature students who go back to them can be sure of finding hints for further study and reflection.'

VINCENT PARKIN

Studies in the Sermon on the Mount, Vol. 2 (Matt. 6 and 7), by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 15s.)

I confess to a certain curiosity when I received this volume. I knew from experience how easily and with what authority Dr Lloyd-Jones moved through the great theological epistles, but I wondered how he would fare when confronting the Sermon on the Mount, with its strong ethical content and apparent absence of theology. I was therefore delighted to find in this volume the same masterly and penetrating exposition. Like the former volume, this contains thirty sermons. This is not 'beating it out too thin'. The richness of each sermon is surprising. One discovers things one never suspected were there. But they *are* there, and one is grateful for the discovery. Moreover, Dr Lloyd-Jones reveals a unity binding together verses or passages which one had hitherto regarded as unrelated: e.g. (a) Matthew 6, is treated as concerned throughout with the Divine Judgement and this assists interpretation; (b) Matthew 6⁷⁻¹¹ is a passage which, if interpreted just as it stands, involves serious difficulties, but if interpreted as part of the overriding theme, the difficulties largely disappear. All who seek to understand the Sermon on the Mount would do well to study this book. Not that anyone will agree with all he finds therein. This is an I.V.F. publication, yet the errors and dangers to which Fundamentalists are prone are as clearly and forcibly set forth as are those prevalent among non-Fundamentalists. But even where one disagrees (and perhaps violently) with his interpretation, one is faced with a challenge that it may be what our Lord meant, after all. All who carefully and sincerely study these sermons will derive much stimulus, enlightenment, insight, and inspiration from them; and will understand why Dr Lloyd-Jones draws such large congregations three times a week to hear him expound the Scriptures. Finally, these sermons are the complete answer to the man who says he has no use for the theology he finds in the Epistles but infinitely prefers the plain ethical teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. If he seriously reads this volume, he will find that the Sermon on the Mount is a profoundly spiritual and theological document which demands a background of Christian theology and Christian experience, if its real significance is to be known and its ethical teaching practised.

HENRY T. WIGLEY

Church Dogmatics, Vol. III, *The Doctrine of Creation*, Part II, by Karl Barth. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 55s.)

The scale of the major work, *Church Dogmatics*, on which Karl Barth is engaged, may be measured by the fact that this volume of 640 pages, many in small print, comprises only Chapter X, The Creature, and deals with the Christian doctrine of man. Barth resolutely refuses to make the doctrine of the creature a doctrine of the universe, and therefore dismisses all cosmologies and is concerned with anthropology alone. He sees the doctrine of man in a doctrine of creation as a whole, 'of heaven and earth as they were created by Almighty God whose mercy and goodness have been revealed to man and not elsewhere, *in parte pro toto*'. 'Real man' is not to be discovered by speculative anthropology, which is human self-knowledge as part of a world-view. This is opposed by the Christian confession. On the other hand, scientific anthropology, the exact science of man, cannot be the enemy of the Christian confession; it does not prejudice in any way the hearing or non-hearing of the Word of God. Barth is adamant in his isolation of theology from the philosophy of religion, and from the German type of literalism. 'Real man' is in a category for which naturalism, idealism, and existentialism are not adequate. In this connexion he gives a careful account of Brunner's attempt 'to break the closed circle of existentialist "suspense in sheer possibility" by constructing an ontology and theological anthropology in harmony with the Christian faith', and rejects it after a sustained and acute criticism. Having cleared the ground, Barth turns to the constructive part of his task, and states with his usual architectural logic and Scriptural authority that the doctrine of man is grounded in the fact that one man above all others is the man Jesus. A detailed analysis of the meaning of the Biblical 'I am' leads to the conclusion that the basic form of humanity is man in encounter—a Covenant partner with God in an 'I and Thou' relationship. Here he makes a notable defence of the Greek *eros*. Natural love is a divine gift and brings to the Christian *agapē* the language of gladness and rejoicing, and here Paul's vocabulary is quoted with fine effect. In the discussion of Spirit as the basis of soul and body we have the key to a valuable treatise on the body-soul relationship (344-436), but the definition of Spirit (p.356) needs amplification. Barth rises to the height of his great argument in the last section entitled 'Man in His Time', with 'Jesus, Lord of Time', as the central theme. Here he finally rejects Bultmann's demythologizing of Easter, and defends the genuine historical truth of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. From this all the rest follows: belief in a visible second coming in glory (*parousia*); and in Christ as Lord of all prior time, and of immediate present time, and of all subsequent time to the end of time. Paul tells us this in three prepositions: 'Of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things.' By His Crucifixion, His Resurrection and Ascension, He is the Victor for man over death and sin and guilt, and in Him man may be victorious too (p.621). Here may be mentioned the exposition of the Word of grace, as summing up the Word of God that is spoken in Jesus (pp.164ff), and the study of the Christian community and of the Church as the fellowship of faith and hope (pp.300-17). A masterly survey of the teaching of Nietzsche leads to a categorical Christian reply (pp.228-42). Incidentally, is it fair to bracket Goethe with Nietzsche? And why is 'Man shall not live by bread alone' applied as only true for Israel and Jesus? (p.67). When Barth's technical theology becomes difficult and repetitive, his Scriptural exegesis comes in like the chorus in Greek tragedy, relieving the tension, illuminating the 'argument' and telling as with magical music the truth which makes men free.

S. G. DIMOND

A Shorter Commentary on Romans, by Karl Barth. (S.C.M. Press, 15s.)

It is over forty years since Professor Karl Barth's commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans first appeared. Now he has produced another book on the same theme. It is not an abridgement of the earlier commentary, however, but a new work. Free from the philosophical language of the earlier book, its style is more lucid and less volcanic. It clearly sets forth the plan of the Epistle, and vividly depicts the sweep of Paul's thought. The views expressed are representative of Barth's later theological position. Barth's intention is to 'let Paul speak for himself'. An interpreter, however, is bound to give his own accent to a commentary, and many distinctively Barthian notes are sounded in this work. He rejects the idea that there can be a 'natural' knowledge of God apart from the Christian revelation. He emphasizes the passive part of man in the drama of salvation. God has shown his love to man 'by placing him, in Jesus Christ, apart from and against all his feeling, willing, and knowing, in a position where he is allowed to find himself in harmony with God' (p.58). Sanctification is 'such that it has happened independently of your good or bad will' (p.71). Barth stresses the continual tension of the Christian life. It is 'as prodigal sons, lost children' that men cry to God 'Abba, Father (p.95)'. Little is said of the possibility of progress and growth in the Christian life. The discussion of Paul's affectionate personal greetings in the sixteenth chapter is livelier and longer than in the earlier commentary. This interest in the individual members of the Church provides a clue to one of the purposes of Barth's book. The *Shorter Commentary* originated in a course of extra-mural lectures which he delivered at Basel during the winter of 1940-1. It is obviously intended to be read by many people who will have neither time nor opportunity to study the earlier commentary or the *Church Dogmatics*. But Barth does not attempt to answer many of the queries which may arise in the minds of his readers especially when they are confronted with his views about the Atonement and Predestination. His purpose is to declare rather than to defend the gospel, and in this book, as in his *Dogmatics in Outline*, he is declaring it to an audience which is much wider than the circle of professional theologians.

ARTHUR W. WAINWRIGHT

The Priesthood of All Believers, by Cyril Eastwood. (Epworth Press, 30s.)

The appearance of a book bearing this title is an event. No major writing on this subject has previously appeared in the English language, and this book is a worthy pioneer. It is scholarly. It shows evidence of familiarity with most of the relevant literature, and is deeply evangelical. It is a commendation of the doctrine as well as an exposition of it. The sub-title carries the words, 'An Examination of the Doctrine from the Reformation to the Present Day'. Very little attention is given to the biblical basis of the doctrine and, as is customary in some sections of Evangelicalism, the period between the early Church and the Reformation is passed by. It was the bad period when God withheld His providence from His Church and the primitive faith was spoiled. The Reformation, however, put things right and produced the giants. The teaching of Luther, Calvin, representative Anglicans and Puritans, and Methodists is examined in considerable detail, and in the last chapter the writer draws his own conclusions. Everyone knows that it is almost impossible to write on this subject without bias, and the many sallies against Catholic positions leave no doubt about Dr Eastwood's predilections and prejudices. He is what we might call a Methodist of the Henry Bett persuasion. This type of churchmanship leads him to select such statements as for Luther 'it does not matter who preaches and who gives the sacraments', to make light of his statements on Church order, and to say that, according to the Roman view, 'supernatural power in the sacraments has no relation to faith'. On the positive side, however, there is much excellent material. Two interests

stand out above all others: the first, that all priesthood is derived from and depends on the High Priesthood of Christ (here Calvin is the leading figure), and the second is the apostolate of the laity. Great stress is laid on the privilege of direct access to God, as open to all believers, though, thanks to Reformation, very few Christians, if any, would now think of denying it. A very considerable labour lies behind the chapters on the Anglicans and the Puritans. It is good to have their positions set forth in such detail and with such clarity. Wesley is adequately dealt with, though in the observations on the Ministry there is, perhaps understandably, no reference to his famous sermon on that subject. If 'it is wrong to suppose that something is bestowed in ordination which is denied to all other Christians', the prayers in the Methodist Ordination Service ought to be re-written, unless we are to say they are merely formal and we should dread the thought of them being answered. The sections on the Ministry apart, however, it is a pleasure to welcome the book. Ministers and laymen will profit by a careful study of it and the life of the Church will be the richer as a result.

PERCY SCOTT

Ethics and the Gospel, by T. W. Manson. (S.C.M. Press at 12s. 6d.)

Dr Manson had delivered and intended to publish these lectures, but had in fact only, at the time of his death, begun the revision for publication of the first lecture and the first few pages of the manuscript of the second. The preparation of the others for publication along the lines Professor Manson had indicated has been carried through by the Rev. Ronald Preston, Lecturer in Christian Ethics in the University of Manchester. In Chapter I, which deals with the Old Testament background, there is an instructive contrast between the Hebrew and Greek way of thinking of the community and the place of the individual within it. The most significant part of the chapter for the theme of the whole book is the treatment of the Hebrew idea of Kingship. The background for the Gospel is further depicted in the chapter on Judaism and the Law of Moses, where the three foundations of civilization are shown to be law, worship, and 'the imparting of kindnesses'. It is stated that the supreme command and the supreme motive for Judaism was the love of God. 'Jesus and the Law of Moses' deals mainly with the Sermon on the Mount, distinguishing between sources Q and M, attacking Butler's view of the originality of Matthew in a footnote, and showing that here for disciples is the way they must live if their citizenship of the Kingdom of God is to be a reality. In Chapter IV the idea of the role of the King discussed in Chapter I is shown to be relevant for Christian living whose distinctive feature is the commandment, 'Love as I have loved you'. 'The Earliest Christian Community' deals only with the early chapters of Acts and does not include any discussion of the terms of admission of Gentiles. In the discussion of the life of the Church as described in Acts 2₄₂ and Acts 2₄₄₋₆, it is not immediately obvious what is meant by the sentence: 'The third thing in verse 46 is that they were "assiduous in one accord in the Temple" and that, I think, belongs with number four, the breaking of bread.' The final chapter on 'The Original Teaching of Jesus and the Ethics of the Early Church' refers the sayings of Jesus to their original setting in life and acknowledges indebtedness to the works of Dodd and Jeremias on the Parables. The conclusion is that the Christian ethic inevitably comes back to Christ Himself. The book is a suggestive rather than an exhaustive treatment of the subject.

VINCENT PARKIN

Studies in Biblical Theology. (S.C.M. Press.)

No. 28, *Lordship and Discipleship*, by Eduard Schweizer. (10s. 6d.)

This is the first to appear in English of the works of the eminent Professor of New Testament in the University of Zürich. It is not merely a rendering by a translator

of an existing German work, but an entirely revised edition, made in English by the author himself, of a book originally published in 1955 under the title *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgen*. Perhaps for this reason the book does not make easy reading. The German title provides a better description of the contents of the book than that chosen for the English edition, for its theme is the interpretation of the significance of Jesus in terms of humiliation followed by exaltation, and of Christian discipleship as following him along the same path *via* rejection and suffering to glory. The opening chapter discusses the meaning of discipleship in the teaching of Jesus Himself, as it applied to those who followed Him during His earthly ministry. The author then discusses the idea, which he shows to have been very familiar to Judaism, of 'the righteous one who humbles himself or voluntarily accepts humiliation by suffering and death in obedience to God' and who as a reward 'is exalted by God, secretly already upon earth, but especially in the world to come'. There follow six chapters in which it is shown how determinative this picture proved to be in the New Testament presentation of Jesus. He is *the* Righteous One whose suffering and exaltation is the eschatological fulfilment of that of Israel, so that He is the Representative of the True Israel. In the earliest thought of the Church, the emphasis was placed, not upon the death of Jesus as having atoning significance, but upon the Resurrection, which was regarded as His exaltation to be the 'Lord'. The author traces the development from this idea to that of Jesus, first as the One who was humiliated from Divine Glory and exalted to Divine Glory (cf. Phil 2⁶⁻¹¹, etc.), and then as the One obedient in suffering and therefore exalted to the Father (cf. the Fourth Gospel and Hebrews). Next comes a further chapter on Discipleship, this time as it came to be understood after Easter; the idea of 'following' was no longer applicable, but the essential meaning of discipleship remained the same. It is a sharing in the suffering and exaltation of Jesus, not by imitating His example, but by being taken by Him on His way. After two chapters on the Unity and Variations, respectively, of the Confession of Christ as revealed in the foregoing inquiry, the author proceeds to show how relevant this developed message about the Lordship of Jesus and the meaning of discipleship proved to be for the Hellenistic Church. It could be 'translated' into categories meaningful for Hellenistic man, without in the process losing its essential and original meaning (in this connexion the work of Paul becomes specially significant). It is here that the practical importance of the whole study is held to lie, for the author starts from the conviction that the Church of today 'is not greatly troubled by a sense of sin, as was the ancient Palestinian Church', but that, 'like the Hellenistic Church . . . she is troubled by the question of the meaning of man's life and by fear of a fate against which man is helpless'. The complex and somewhat involved argument of the whole book is designed to show that the New Testament does supply an answer to these questions, so that the study 'may perhaps help the preaching of the Gospel to remain a *viva vox* and not to deteriorate into a gramophone record'. However that may be, the student who is prepared to work his way patiently through this difficult book will certainly be rewarded by many fresh and illuminating insights into the New Testament understanding of Christ and of the meaning of discipleship.

OWEN E. EVANS

Wesley's Christology, an Interpretation by John Deschner.

Wesley's Christology, reviewed in the January issue, is being distributed in the United Kingdom by the Epworth Press, and is obtainable from them at 30s.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- The Expository Times*, August 1960.
 St Paul and the Greek World, by Sir Evelyn Howell.
 The Provenance of the Fourth Gospel, by C. Leslie Mitton.
- The Expository Times*, September, 1960.
 The Principles of the Scottish Reformation, by Stewart Mechie.
 The Evidence in the New Testament for Early Creeds, Catechisms, and Liturgy, by G. W. H. Lampe.
- Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times: The Cynics, by William Barclay.
- The Expository Times*, October 1960.
 When did the Fall occur? by J. Wren-Lewis.
 Religious Certainty—I, by Vincent Taylor.
 Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times: The Cyrenaics, by William Barclay.
- The Expository Times*, November 1960.
 Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels, by R. McL. Wilson.
 Religious Certainty—II, by Vincent Taylor.
- The Expository Times*, December 1960.
 The Will of God: in the Synoptic Tradition of the Words of Jesus, by C. Leslie Mitton.
 Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times: The Epicureans—I, by William Barclay.
 The Temptations, by P. Doble.
- The Harvard Review*, July 1960.
 A Second-century Treatise on Egyptian Priests and Temples, by V. B. Schuman.
 Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea, by H. Chadwick.
 Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England, by W. A. Chaney.
- The Harvard Review*, October 1960.
 Sur le Culte D'Angelos dans le Pagansime Grec et Romain, by F. Sokolowski.
 'Thomas' and the Growth of the Gospels, by R. McL. Wilson.
 A Letter of Meletius of Antioch, by W. A. Jurgens.
 The Trinitarian Theology of Augustine and His Debt to Plotinus, by T. A. Wassmer, S.J.
 Milton's Arianism, by J. H. Adamson.
 A Contemporary Report on the Condition of the Catholic Church in Russia, 1922, by J. J. Zatko.
- The Hibbert Journal*, October 1960.
 The Problem of a Philosophical Theology, by B. M. G. Reardon.
 The Coming Copernican Christology, by W. O. Johnson.
 Some Reflections on Questions of Population, by E. A. Wrigley.
 Allah and Caesar, by E. Gellner.
 More an Antique Roman than a Dane (a study of Hamlet), by W. Montgomerie.
- Interpretation*, October 1960.
 Problem and Relevance: Authority and the Bible, by R. H. Bryant.
 'Oneness' and Process; Revelation and Proclamation in the Christian Faith, by R. E. Gibson.
 Hebrew Language and Israelite Faith, by A. R. McAllaster.
 The Fear of the Lord is the Beginning of Wisdom, by Karl Barth.
- The Journal of Politics*, August 1960.
 Economic Development: Political Pre-conditions and Political Consequences, by J. J. Spengler.
 How to Read Milton's *Areopagitica*, by W. Kendall.
- Theology Today*, July 1960.
 Schleiermacher on Language and Feeling, by Richard R. Niebuhr.
 'Thou art Peter', by G. F. A. Knight.
 Reinhold Niebuhr and Apologetics, by J. H. Gill.
 Theological Table-talk, by G. S. Hendry.
- The International Review of Missions*, October 1960.
 The Training of an indigenous ministry figures prominently in this issue, and is represented by five important articles. In addition:
 Christian Homes and Family Life in Kenya Today, by Anne Barnett.
 A Grain of Wheat: Toyohiko Kagawa, 1888-1960, by N. J. Kikuchi.
 Serenity and Labour: John Merle Davis, 1875-1960, by F. F. Goodsall.
 Defeatist Protestantism and Open Doors in India, by Din Dayal.
- The Scottish Journal of Theology*, September 1960.
 Justification: Its Radical Nature and Place in Reformed Doctrine and Life, by T. F. Torrance.
 The Integrity of Faith: An Enquiry into the meaning of Law in the Thought of John Calvin, by R. A. Gessert.
 The Justification of a Sinner before God, by R. Preus.
 The Creeds of A.D. 325: Antioch, Caesarea, Nicaea, by T. E. Pollard.
- The Scottish Journal of Theology*, December 1960.
 Reason and Revelation in Luther, by B. Lohse.
 Barth on Revelation, by T. H. L. Parker.
 Christ's Sacrifice for Sin, by A. I. Dunlop.
 More Quests of the Historical Jesus, by A. Barr.
 Changing Emphases in the Work of the Ministry, by W. S. Tindal.

Our Contributors

- ERIC W. BAKER**
M.A., D.D., PH.D.
President of the Methodist Conference, 1959-60; Secretary since 1951. Member of Central Committee, World Council of Churches, Cambridge University Prizeman, 1922.
- G. S. DUNCAN**
O.B.E., D.D., LL.D.
Formerly Professor of Biblical Criticism, and Principal of St Mary's College, in the University of St Andrews, was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1949. Author of Theological works.
- ADAM FOX**
M.A., D.D.
A schoolmaster, then a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Now a Canon of Westminster. He has written a few books, and his *Dean Inge* has just been awarded the James Tait Black Memorial Book Prize for 'the best biography of 1960'.
- A. RAYMOND GEORGE**
M.A., B.D.
Methodist Minister. Lamplough Tutor in Systematic and Pastoral Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds. Associate Lecturer, University of Leeds. Secretary, European Theological Commission on Worship.
- KENNETH GRAYSTON**
M.A.
Methodist member of the Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible. Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature at Didsbury College; Special Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek and Deputy Head of the School of Theology, Bristol University.
- C. S. LEWIS**
Fellow of Magdalene College and Professor of Medieval and Renaissance English in the University of Cambridge.
- W. F. LOFTHOUSE**
M.A., D.D.
Methodist Minister. President of the Wesleyan Conference, 1929. Sometime tutor and later Principal at Handsworth College. Author of works on Theology and Sociology.
- HAROLD K. MOULTON**
M.A.
King's College, Cambridge. Son of James Hope Moulton and grandson of W. F. Moulton, New Testament Reviser, 1881. New Testament Professor, United Theological College, Bangalore, 1932-57. Tamil New Testament Revision Committee, 1940-7. Now Deputy Translations Secretary, British and Foreign Bible Society. Author of *The Acts of the Apostles*.
- WALTER J. NOBLE**
D.D.
Accepted as candidate for the Ministry, 1898; called out from Didsbury College, 1900, for service in Ceylon, where he worked for twenty-two years. Appointed General Secretary, Methodist Missionary Society, 1922. President of the Conference, 1942.
- SUSIE I. TUCKER**
M.A.
Senior Lecturer in English, the University of Bristol. Graduated from the University College of the South-west, Exeter, and from Somerville College, Oxford (Vernon-Harcourt Scholar). Interests lie in medieval English and Norse literature and the growth of modern English. Has compiled linguistic anthology, *English Examined*.
- JOHN T. WILKINSON**
M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.
Ranmoor Tutor in Church History and English (1946-59) and Principal (1953-9) of Hartley Victoria College, Manchester. Author of *Richard Baxter and Margaret Charlton: A Puritan Love-Story*; *Hugh Bourne (1772-1852)*; *William Clowes (1780-1851)*; *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, 1960), etc.
- DR A. T. P. WILLIAMS,**
THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER
Scholar, Jesus College, Oxford, and D.D. of Oxford, Durham, St Andrews and Glasgow. Hon. Fellow of All Souls, Jesus College, and Hon. Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Headmaster, Winchester College, 1924-34. Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, 1934-9. Bishop of Durham, 1939-52. Bishop of Winchester from 1952. Chairman of the Joint Committee for the New Translation of the Bible.

since
cil of

Mary's
of the
Author

xford.
books,
Black

i Pas-
college,
Leeds.
orship.

Trans-
ye and
enistic
Bristol

al and

erence,
worth

n and
1881.

Banga-
mittee,
h and
rs.

t from
worked
hodist
1942.

duated
r, and
holar).
nd the
ology,

9) and
hester.
Puritan
(1780-
morial

arham,
Jesus
Head-
church,
op of
tee for

hed by

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

THE ENDURING PASSION

The Methodist Lent Book for 1961

By T. E. Jessop

In this Lent Book, Professor Jessop is concerned with what he calls the antecedents of the historic Calvary, as much as with the facts of the drama itself. Chapters of deep perceptive power, telling of the Humility of God, the Agony of God, and the divinity of Love, are followed by chapters concerned with the human response—the Devotional and the Moral.

Paper covers, 5s. Boards, 7s. 6d. net

WESTMINSTER SERMONS

By W. E. Sangster

Volume I. At Morning Worship

Volume II. At Fast and Festival

The late Dr Sangster, who was widely recognized as one of the outstanding preachers of his day, preached in the Westminster Central Hall for years to congregations which well exceeded 2,500 people, and in response to many requests he made a representative collection of the sermons which held the people and drew them back again.

Each 12s. 6d. net

PROTESTANT PATRIARCH

A Life of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1572-1638

By George A. Hadjiantiou

A biography of one of the great Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox Church, and its first important theologian since the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

30s. net

JOHN WESLEY

By Ingvar Haddad

This biography has met with great and deserved success in Norway. It presents the leader of Methodism as a human being, and not only as an epoch-making ecclesiastic. Readers who look for a good historical story admirably told will find here a work worthy of their attention. (*Translated from the Norwegian by C. J. Allan.*)

18s. 6d. net

(Ready shortly)

PASTORAL CARE IN A CHANGING WORLD

By Erastus Evans

This is a search for what is specific to the pastor in his approach to the human encounter, in his estimate of man, in his use of speech, and in his attitude to depth psychology and to scientific healing. It tries to indicate his valid place in the modern world, so that he may attend to the task that is peculiarly his.

8s. 6d. net

A PLAIN MAN LOOKS AT THE CROSS

By Leslie D. Weatherhead

In this account of Christ's work, both deeply moving and intellectually satisfying, the author shares his insights and discoveries with his readers. This is the first cheap edition of Dr Weatherhead's lovely Easter book.

(A new Weyern Book, No. 22.) 2s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

FROM ALL BOOKSELLERS

The New English Bible

The first part of the new translation undertaken
by all the major Christian bodies in the British
Isles other than the Roman Catholic.

Popular Edition 8s. 6d. net Library Edition 21s. net

New Testament

Oxford University Press Cambridge University Press

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

LIVING EDUCATION

By T. B. Shepherd

This book expresses the views on Education of a man who has presumably cross-examined a fair sample of British Youth concerning their schooldays. He pleads strongly for a link between Church and school; emphasizes the importance of the three 'r's', and rightfully condemns the unrealities of many present-day exercises.

A new and enlarged edition. 18s. net

(Ready shortly)

TEACHING: BEGIN HERE

By W. T. Davies, M.A., and T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D.

The aims of education are discussed, and the preparation and planning of various types of activities and lessons is described. Other sections are devoted to the use of visual aids, the radio, the film, and discussion groups.

A new and revised edition. 13s. 6d. net.

THE APOSTLES' CREED

Some letters of a Methodist godfather

By Donald Hughes

The author writes: 'It would be absurd to regard this short book as an adequate theological or philosophical apologetic. I have written it in an effort to answer some of the questions which I know people start to ask after they have been saying the Creed for some time. If it is of any help to anyone at this stage it will have served its purpose.'

3s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1